DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 352 HE 004 518

AUTHOR	Flowers, George A., Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Summary of Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association of Urban Universities (58th, Jacksonville, Florida, March 5-6, 1972).
INSTITUTION	Association of Urban Universities.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	87p.; Summary of the 58th annual conference of the Association of Urban Universities, Jacksonville, Florida, November 5-6, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; *Higher Education; *Universities; *Urban Education; Urban Schools; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

This document presents a summary of the proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities. Following a historical introduction, member institutions, officers 1971-72, and committee are listed. The program for the conference, various addresses and reports of the committees are included. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081352

The Association of Urban Universities

SUMMARY OF
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting
of

The ASSOCIATION of
URBAN UNIVERSITIES

at Jacksonville, Florida

1972

Forty-Ninth Report

HE 004 518

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 081352

The Association of

Urban Universities

FIFTY-EIGHTH

ANNUAL MEETING

1972

Summary of Proceedings

Edited by George A. Flowers, Jr.
Director of Public Relations
Jacksonville University
Jacksonville, Florida 32211

November 5-6, 1972
Jacksonville University
Jacksonville, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Historical Introduction 5

Member Institutions 9

Officers 1971-1972 14

Committees, 1971-1972 14

Program for Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting 16

Sunday Evening Session November 5, 1972
Meeting called to order
Harold L. Enarson presiding 18

Greetings from host
Robert H. Spiro, President, Jacksonville University 18

Address
Dr. John D. Millett, Vice President and Director,
Management Division, Academy for
Educational Development Inc. 21

Adjournment of Sunday evening session 34

Monday Morning Session
Harold L. Enarson presiding 35

Report on membership
Robert H. Spiro 35

Report of Secretary-Treasurer
Robert H. Spiro 36

Report of Auditing Committee
T. W. Van Arsdale 37

Report of Resolutions Committee
J. Martin Klotsche 38

Report of Nominating Committee
Malcolm Carron, S.J. 40

Report of Breakfast Discussions
John P. Raynor, S.J. 41

Group I Malcolm Carron, S.J. 42

Group II T. W. Van Arsdale 43

Group III D. J. Guzzetta 46

Adjournment of Business Session 59

Monday Luncheon Session Novembe. 6, 1972
Harold L. Enarson presiding 60

Address
Dr. Ralph R. Widner, Director
Academy for Contemporary Problems 61

Adjournment of Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting
Harold L. Enarson 72

Appendices
A Constitution of the Association 73
B Chronological List of Officers of the Association 75
C Registered Attendance Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting 79
D Financial Report, 1972 82
E Procedure for Application for Membership 84
F Instituticnal Libraries Holding Complete Sets of the Proceedings of Association's Annual Meetings 85

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The Association of Urban Universities was founded as the result of a conference "of all municipal universities and other universities in cities interested in the service of their communities," held in connection with the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities at Washington, D. C., November 9 and 10, 1914. On November 11, 1914, the permanent organization of the Association of Urban Universities was definitely formed. The Association promotes the study of problems of particular interest to urban universities, including adult education, community service, and university extension.

A full report of the proceedings of the first meeting was published by the United States Bureau of Education as Bulletin, 1915, No. 38, under the title, "The University and the Municipality."

The second meeting was held in Cincinnati, November 15, 16, and 17, 1915, and the proceedings were printed as Bulletin, 1916, No. 30, of the Bureau of Education. These two bulletins contain detailed information concerning the formation of the Association, its aims and its practical program.

The third conference was held in New York on November 15, 16, and 17, 1917. A full report of this meeting was not published, but a summary of the proceedings appeared in the introduction to the printed report of the 1919 meeting of Boston. Because of the war, no meeting was held in 1918.

The fourth meeting was held in Pittsburgh, November 15, 16, and 17, 1917. A full report of this meeting was not published, but a summary of the proceedings appeared in the introduction to the printed report of the 1919 meeting of Boston. Because of the war, no meeting was held in 1918.

The fifth conference, at Boston, was held on December 19 and 20, 1919, and the published account of the meeting appeared as the Fourth Report.

In 1920, the sixth meeting was held in Philadelphia, on December 16, 17, and 18, with the University of Pennsylvania, Drexel Institute of Technology, and Temple University acting as hosts. The Printed account of the meeting appeared as the Fifth Report.

No reports of the meetings from 1921 to 1926, inclusive, were published. From 1921 to 1925 the annual meetings were held as follows:

Year	Meeting	Place	Host Institution
1921	7th	Cleveland	Case School of Applied Science and Western Reserve University

1922	8th	Minneapolis	University of Minnesota
1923	9th	Buffalo	University of Buffalo
1924	10th	Akron	University of Akron
1925	11th	Washington	George Washington University

The next meeting, 1926, was held at Providence with Brown University as the host; on the printed program this meeting is numbered as the "thirteenth."

Since 1926, reports of all the meetings have been published. Beginning with 1927, the annual meetings have been held and the reports issued as follows:

Year	Meeting	Place	Host Institution	No. of Report
1927	14th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology	6th
1928	15th	New York	City College of New York	7th
1929	16th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati	
1930	17th	Philadelphia	University of Pennsylvania	8th
1931	18th	Toledo	University of Toledo	9th
1932	19th	St. Louis	Washington University	10th
1933	20th	New York	New York University and The City College of New York	14th
1934	21st	Louisville	University of Louisville	12th
1935	22nd	Boston	Boston University	13th
1936	23rd	Detroit	Wayne University	14th
1937	24th	Birmingham	Birmingham-Southern College	15th
1938	25th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati	16th
1939	26th	New York	Hunter College of the City of New York	17th
1940	27th	Omaha	University of Omaha	18th
1941	28th	Cleveland	Western Reserve University and Fenn College	19th

The meeting scheduled to be held in October, 1942, with the University of Rochester as the host institution, was cancelled because of the war.

1943	29th	Chicago	Illinois Institute of Technology	20th
1944	30th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburgh	21st

1945	31st	Philadelphia	Drexel Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania and Temple University	22nd
1946	32nd	New York	City College of New York	23rd
1947	33rd	Minneapolis	University of Minnesota	24th
1948	34th	Pittsburgh	University of Pittsburgh	25th
1949	35th	Chicago	.....	26th
1950	36th	Cleveland	.....	27th
1951	37th	Cincinnati	.....	28th
1952	38th	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne University	29th
1953	39th	St. Louis	St. Louis University and Washington University	30th
1954	40th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, Pennsylvania College for Women, University of Pittsburgh	31st
1955	41st	Milwaukee	Marquette University	32nd
1956	42nd	Cleveland	Case Institute of Technology, Western Reserve University, and Fenn College	33rd
1957	43rd	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne State University	34th
1958	44th	Omaha	Creighton University and University of Omaha	35th
1959	45th	Buffalo	University of Buffalo and Canisius College	36th
1960	46th	Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati and Xavier University	37th
1961	47th	Chicago	DePaul University, Illinois Institute of Technology, Loyola University, Northwestern University, Roosevelt University, University of Illinois	38th
1962	48th	Louisville	University of Louisville	39th
1963	49th	New Orleans	Tulane University	40th
1964	50th	Pittsburgh	Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, University of Pittsburgh	41st

1965	51st	St. Louis	St. Louis University and Washington University	42nd
1966	52nd	Milwaukee	Marquette University and University of Wisconsin — Milwaukee	43rd
1967	53rd	Detroit	University of Detroit and Wayne State University	44th
1968	54th	Houston	University of Houston	45th
1969	55th	Akron	University of Akron	46th
1970	56th	Miami	University of Miami	47th
1971	57th	Chicago	University of Illinois / Chicago Circle Campus	48th
1972	58th	Jacksonville	Jacksonville University	49th

The Association publishes the Proceedings of its Annual Meeting and distributes a copy to each member institution. A limited number of copies is available for free distribution to interested persons, agencies, and institutions. Requests should be addressed to George A. Flowers, Jr., Director, Public Relations, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida 32211.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS
November 1972

Below are listed member institutions and their chief executive officers. Charter members are indicated by an asterisk; the date in parentheses following the name of each of the other members indicates the first year of membership.

Adelphi University
Garden City, Long Island, N.Y. (1970)
President Timothy W. Costello

*Akron, The University of
Akron, Ohio
President Dominic J. Guzzetta

Alabama, University of
In Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama (1971)
President J. F. Volker

American University
Washington, D.C. (1944)
President George H. Williams

Arkansas, University of
Little Rock, Arkansas (1960)
President Carey V. Stabler

Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
President J. Donald Monan, S.J.

*Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts
President John R. Silber

Bradley University
Peoria, Illinois (1947)
Chancellor Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr.

Bridegport, University of
Bridgeport, Connecticut (1952)
President Thurston E. Manning

Brooklyn College
See City University of New York

Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana (1945)
President A. E. Jones

Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio (1948)
President Louis A. Toepfer

Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. (1968)
President Clarence C. Walton

Chicago State College
Chicago, Illinois (1967)
President Milton B. Byrd

*Cincinnati, University of
Cincinnati, Ohio
President Warren G. Bennis
Vice President Charles Johnson

*City College of New York
See City University of New York

City University of New York
New York, New York
Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee

Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York (1952)
President John W. Kneller

*City College
New York, New York
President Robert E. Marshall

*Hunter College
New York, New York
President Jacqueline G. Wexler

Queens College
Flushing, New York (1939)
President Joseph S. Murphy

Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio (1956)
President Harry Newburn

Colorado, University of
Denver Center
Denver, Colorado (1971)
President F. P. Thieme
Vice President Joe J. Keen

Cooper Union
Cooper Square, New York, New York (1950)
President John F. White

Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska (1951)
President Joseph J. Labaj, S.J.

Dayton, University of
Dayton, Ohio (1962)
President Raymond A. Roesch, S.M.

Delaware, University of
Newark, Delaware (1970)
President Edward A. Trabant

Denver, University of
Denver, Colorado (1915)
Chancellor Maurice B. Mitchell

DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois (1948)
President John R. Cortelyou, C.M.

Detroit, University of
Detroit, Michigan (1932)
President Malcolm Carron, S.J.

Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa (1960)
President Wilbur C. Miller
Vice President Hoke L. Smith

Drexel University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1915)
President William Walsh Hagerty

Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1950)
President Henry J. McAnulty, C.S.Sp.

Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut (1970)
President William C. McInnes, S.J.

Fairleigh Dickinson University
Teaneck, New Jersey (1955)
President J. Osborn Fuller

Fordham University
New York, New York (1930)
President James C. Finlay, S.J.

General Motors Institute
Flint, Michigan (1962)
President Harold P. Rodes

George Washington University
Washington, D.C. (1924)
President Lloyd H. Elliott

Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. (1968)
President Robert J. Henle, S.J.

Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia (1958)
President Noah Langdale, Jr.

Hartford, University of
West Hartford, Connecticut
Chancellor A. M. Woodruff
Vice Chancellor Alan S. Wilson

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts (1915)
President Derek C. Bok

Hofstra University
Hempstead, L.I., New York (1954)
President Clifford Lee Lord

Houston, University of
Houston, Texas (1957)
President Philip G. Hoffman

Hunter College
See City University of New York

Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois (1939)
President John T. Rettaliata

Illinois, University of
Urbana, Illinois (1951)
President John E. Corbally
Chancellor Warren B. Cheston
Chicago Circle Campus

Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana (1970)
President Alan C. Rankin

Indiana University
Purdue University at Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana (1969)
Chancellor Maynard K. Hine

Jacksonville University
Jacksonville, Florida (1962)
President Robert H. Spiro

Jersey City State College
Jersey City, New Jersey (1970)
President James H. Mullen

John Carroll University
Cleveland, Ohio (1956)
President Henry F. Birkenhauer, S.J.

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland (1968)
President Steven Muller

LaSalle College
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
(1970)
President Daniel Burke, F.S.C.
Long Island University
Greenvale, New York (1961)
Chancellor Albert Bush-Brown
*Louisville, University of
Louisville, Kentucky
Acting President William F.
Ekstrom
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois (1950)
President Raymond C.
Baumhart, S.J.
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana (1963)
President Michael F. Kennelly,
S.J.

Maine, University of
Portland, Maine (1969)
President L. J. P. Calisti
Manhattan College
Bronx, New York (1970)
President Gregory Nugent, F.S.C.
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin (1948)
President John P. Raynor, S.J.
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Cambridge, Mass. (1952)
President J. B. Wiesner
Massachusetts University of
Boston, Massachusetts (1967)
Chancellor Francis L. Broderick
President Robert C. Wood
Amherst, Mass.
Miami, University of
Coral Gables, Florida (1941)
President Henry King Stanford
Michigan, University of
Dearborn, Michigan (1972)
Chancellor Leonard E. Goodall
Mississippi College
Clinton, Mississippi (1965)
President William L. Nobles
Missouri, University of at
Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri (1953)
Chancellor James C. Olson
Monmouth College
West Long Island, New Jersey
(1969)
President R. J. Stonesifer

Nebraska, University of, at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska (1937)
Chancellor Ronald W. Roskens
Newark College of Engineering
Newark, New Jersey (1929)
President William Hazell
New Haven, University of
West Haven, Connecticut (1970)
President Marvin K. Peterson
*New York University
Washington Square, New York,
New York
President James M. Hester
North Carolina, University of
at Charlotte
Charlotte, North Carolina (1972)
Chancellor D. W. Colvard
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts (1959)
President Asa S. Knowles
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois (1963)
President Rhoten A. Smith
*Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
Chancellor James R. Miller

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio (1970)
President Harold L. Enarson
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
(1952)
President Dolphus Whitten, Jr.
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia (1962)
President James L. Bugg, Jr.

*Pennsylvania, University of
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
President Martin Meyerson
*Pittsburgh, University of

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar
Vice Chancellor Robert C. Brictson

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Brooklyn, New York (1928)
President Arthur Grad

Portland State University
Portland, Oregon (1957)
President Gregory Baker Wolfe

Pratt Institute
Brooklyn, New York (1941)
President Henry Saltzman

Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island (1951)
President Thomas R. Peterson, O.P.

Queens College
See City Unversity of New York

Rhode Island College
Providence, Rhode Island (1969)
President Joseph F. Kauffman

Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, New York (1968)
President Paul A. Miller

Rochester, University of
Rochester, New York (1968)
President W. Allen Wallis

Roosevelt University
Chicago, Illinois (1947)
President Rolf A. Weil

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, New Jersey (1946)
President Edward J. Bloustein

Sacred Heart University
Bridgeport, Connecticut (1970)
President William H. Conley

Saint John's University
Jamaica, New York (1939)
President Joseph T. Cahill, C.M.

Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri (1948)
President Paul C. Reinert, S.J.

Saint Peter's College
Jersey City, New Jersey (1969)
President Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.

Samford University
Birmingham, Alabama (1950)
President Leslie S. Wright

San Diego State College
San Diego, California (1970)
Acting President Donald E. Walker

South Alabama, University of
Mobile, Alabama (1969)
President Frederick P. Whiddon

South Florida, University of
Tampa, Florida (1966)
President M. Cecil Mackey

Southern California, University of
Los Angeles, California (1930)
President John R. Hubbard

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois (1958)
President David R. Derge

Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas (1952)
President Willis Tate

Southern Mississippi, University of
Hattiesburg, Mississippi (1950)
President William D. McCain

Southwestern at Memphis
Memphis, Tennessee (1936)
President William L. Bowden

*State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York
President Robert L. Ketter

Stevens Institute of Technology
Hoboken, New Jersey (1951)
President Jess H. Davis

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York (1915)
Chancellor Melvin A. Eggers

Tampa, University of
Tampa, Florida (1952)
President Bob D. Owens

*Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
President Paul Anderson

Tennessee, University of

Knoxville, Tennessee (1970)
President Edward J. Boling

Tennessee, University of at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee (1969)
President William H. Masterson

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas (1971)
President G. M. Sawyer

Toledo, University of
Toledo, Ohio
President Glen R. Driscoll

Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts (1968)
President Burton C. Hallowell

Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana (1954)
President H. E. Longnecker

Tulsa, University of
Tulsa, Oklahoma (1953)
President J. Paschal Twyman

Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee (1970)
Chancellor Alexander Heard

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia (1971)
President Warren W. Brandt

Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan (1929)
President George E. Gullen, Jr.

Western New England College
Springfield, Massachusetts (1969)
President Beaumont A. Herman

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas (1927)
President Clark Ahlberg

Wisconsin, University of
Madison, Wisconsin (1960)
President John C. Weaver
Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche (Milwaukee Campus)

Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio (1969)
President Brage Golding
Vice President Robert J. Kegerreif

Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio (1951)
President Robert W. Mulligan, S.J.

Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio (1950)
President A. L. Pugsley

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1972-1973

President:	John P. Raynor, S.J. President, Marquette University
Vice President:	James C. Olson Chancellor, University of Missouri at Kansas City
Secretary-Treasurer:	Robert H. Spiro President, Jacksonville University

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1971-1972

President:	Harold L. Enarson President, Cleveland State University
Vice President:	John P. Raynor, S.J. President, Marquette University
Secretary-Treasurer:	Robert H. Spiro President, Jacksonville University

COMMITTEES — 1971-1972

AUDITING COMMITTEE:

Chancellor Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr., Chairman
Bradley University

President William Hazell
Newark College of Engineering

NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

President Lloyd H. Elliott
George Washington University

President Philip G. Hoffman
University of Houston

President Malcolm Carron, S.J.
University of Detroit

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE:

Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee Campus)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ASSOCIATION ON THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

Harold L. Enarson (1974)
Cleveland State University

Robert H. Spiro (1974)
Jacksonville University

J. Martin Klotsche (1975)
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Talman W. Van Arsdale, Jr. (1975)
Bradley University

Lloyd H. Elliott (1976)
George Washington University

Phillip G. Hoffman (1976)
University of Houston

PROGRAM

Sunday, November 5, 1972

2:00 p.m.—**Registration**: First Floor Foyer, Jacksonville Hilton Hotel.

3:00 p.m.—**Bus Tour**: Jacksonville University Campus.

5:00 p.m.—**Annual Reception**: The President's Home, Jacksonville University. Dr. and Mrs. Robert H. Spiro, hosts.

7:00 p.m.—**Dinner and Evening Session**: Main Ballroom, Jacksonville Hilton Hotel. President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, presiding.
Welcoming Remarks: Robert H. Spiro, President, Jacksonville University.
Address: John D. Millett, Vice President and Direcrector, Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

Monday, November 6, 1972

7:30 a.m.—**Registration**: First Floor Foyer, Jacksonville Hilton Hotel.

8:00 a.m.—**Group Breakfast Sessions**:
Group I
Discussion Leader: Malcolm Carron, S.J., President, University of Detroit.
Group II
Discussion Leader: T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., Chancellor, Bradley University.
Group III
Discussion Leader: Dominic J. Guzzetta, University of Akron.

General Session:
10:00 p.m.—**Business Session**: Georgia Room, Jacksonville Hilton Hotel. President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, presiding.
Introduction of Visitors
Membership Applications

Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, Robert H. Spiro
Reports of Committees
Auditing—T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr.
Resolutions—J. Martin Klotsche
Nominating—Malcolm Carron, S.J.
Election of Officers
New Business

11:15 a.m.—**Reports of Recorders on Breakfast Sessions:**
Malcolm Carron, S.J.
T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr.
Dominic J. Guzzetta

12:15 p.m.—**Luncheon Session**: Pavilion Room, Jacksonville Hilton Hotel. President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, presiding.
Address: Ralph R. Widner, Director of the Academy for Contemporary Problems.

2:15 p.m.—**Adjournment.**

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS
DINNER AND EVENING SESSION

Sunday, November 5, 1972

The first session of the 58th annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities was held in the Main Ballroom of the Jacksonville Hilton Hotel, Jacksonville, Florida. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Sunday, November 5, 1972, by President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, who presided.

President Harold L. Enarson: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Harold Enarson, and I'm president of this Association by virtue of two considerations: one is unique capabilities for the job, and the second, well known to some of you, is that I failed to attend the meeting last year, and it serves me right. *(Laughter)* And that's why I'm here.

I, as many of you, look forward to this opportunity to chat with colleagues who also inhabit the urban scene. I'm always delighted in the juxtaposition of the urban universities from, I trust, the land grant colleges, and it seems to me that time and tide are on our side. After all, we are part of the urban scene. Everybody else is by definition rural. And if you have read the latest statistical studies of metropolitan areas, you will know that we are gaining America. Of course, it's uninhabitable but it's going to be ours. *(Laughter)* Anyway, we can forget about slums and sickness of the urban scene, at least for a few brief moments, because here we are in the delights of — no, I was going to say the elderly, but that's not quite fair — we're in the delights of Florida, and we have an indefatigable secretary-treasurer who has been planning this brief charming episode in your life ever since the date of the last meeting. He's barely attended to his own community obligations here, as is evident in the fact that there has been some slight decline in enrollment in one of the finest institutions in the south, and I now introduce my good friend, Bob Spiro, your secretary and your treasurer. *(Applause)*

President Robert H. Spiro: Der Fuehrer, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure to add a few words of welcome to you. I would like to say that Harold Enarson is, himself, indefatigable despite the fact that he has suffered the indignity of demotion this year. He has moved from Cleveland State down to Ohio State, where he has 45,000 charges, which in a generous, parietal attitude, he administers, and I doubt if he'll live the year out. But it's good to see

him looking young and hale and hearty and prosperous here early in the game.

I'd like to present two very able people who have worked hard during the year for you, and I refer to the assistant secretary-treasurer, who's assistant to the president in our university, Miss Marion Jarrell. I'd like to ask Miss Jarrell to stand up if she will momentarily. *(Applause)* And Mr. George Flowers, who is the director of news services and public relations for the university, who edits our *Proceedings* and edits our *Newsletter,* and is a very able, fine young man. Mr. George Flowers *(Applause).* And serving with me in the university as my colleague and good friend and man of great ability, I'd like to present Dr. Dan A. Thomas and his wife Elizabeth and ask them to stand and let you all see them. *(Applause)*

Dan is a physicist. Sometimes we say to each other: "Well, you're a physicist," and he says I'm a historian; and we sometimes feel like has beens. But I think the medical doctors always say once a doctor always a doctor, and Dan and I will keep our faculty position in that respect.

We hope that you are comfortable in your hotel accommodations. We certainly were pleased, Mrs. Spiro and I, to welcome you to our home. And during your stay here — we have a small, intimate, fine group — if we can be of any service to you, Miss Jarrell, Mr. Flowers, Dean Thomas, Mrs. Thomas, my wife Suenell, and I will be glad to do anything we can to make the meeting and the accommodations as pleasant as possible.

We are fortunate in having two distinguished speakers to address us and to help us to understand some of our problems. I think you will hear later from either Harold or my wife about plans for tomorrow morning for the wives of our guests. In short, let me bid you welcome and offer you the services of the university and the good will and accommodations of our fine city. I hope you will have a chance to look around, and if some of you can stay a day or two, we will be glad to arrange any other accommodations for you. Some of you indicated you might like a few weeks of golf and swimming, and anything we can do to make you welcome and happy here we shall do so. *(Applause)*

President Enarson: Thank you very much, Bob. I just made a mental note to send your name in to the presidential search committee of the University of Alaska. You deserve it. *(Laughter)*

I hope you will forgive me, for I'm so captivated when I'm around Bob that I'm mesmerized, but I really overlooked a very important thing, and that is my failure to introduce my colleague, Father Raynor, who is vice president of this Association, president of Marquette. Father Raynor. *(Applause)* And although I'm sure that our committee in charge of writing resolutions, although it has not been named yet, will be given the opportunity and the obligation of writing a splendiferous note of thanks to our host and hostess. I'm going to beat them to the punch and ask you to express our appreciation to a marvelous hostess, Mrs. Spiro. *(Applause)*

It truly is a privilege to introduce John Millett to this group. He's retired recently as chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. In his academic discipline, he is trained in *the* master craft (that's public administration in case you are curious, my own field as well). He is a man who has been through it all as a faculty member, as a professor at Columbia, as a scholar in the field of finance of higher education, as president of a major university, Miami, for an 11-year period, 1953-1964, and for the past eight years as chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, which by any fair test is one of the hot seats in the American educational system.

John is a remarkable human being, some — I won't say peculiar — but some difficult combination of scholar and practitioner. He's the holder of nineteen honorary degrees, and, John, I'm tempted to say that there are at least nineteen cities in Ohio which have been denied the opportunity to establish four-year colleges and universities who would cheerfully take those degrees away from you if they had the chance. *(Laughter)*

John Millett is a man of strong ideas, strong convictions, and thank God for that. He has done an extraordinary job as leader of the state system in Ohio. There's not a president in the state that doesn't bear scars and bruises but who also doesn't know in his heart that here is a man truly thoughtful, truly indefatigable, truly interested in the best interests of higher education. And I think, John, that the most flattering ultimate comment that I could make to this or any other audience is that John Millett, now in a brand new career as one of the vice presidents of the Academy for Educational Development, is in the truest and best sense of the word continuing as a student of higher education and of higher education in the political process. It gives me great pleasure, John, to introduce you to this audience and they to you. Dr. Millett. *(Applause)*

Dr. John D. Millett: Thank you, Harold. It's my pleasure to be here. Harold was very worried about me and asked me to come down this evening because he figured that now that I was unemployed I didn't have anything to do and he was afraid that I'd languish. He thought the least he could do would be to expose me to you, and then you'd have more sympathy for what the state university presidents have had to put up with in Ohio for the last eight years.

I'm going to be very informal about what I want to say this evening and wander around. In fact, I think I shall spend a good deal of time inflicting anecdotes upon you. I am now sixty years of age and I have reached my "anecdotage." And I see no reason in the world why I shouldn't make the most of it, and there isn't and good TV program on at 8 o'clock on Sunday anyway, so you might just as well stay here and be bored.

This will give me an opportunity to try some stories I'm afraid a good many people in Ohio will have heard from time to time but hopefully you haven't. For example, I must start off with my favorite story about Florida. My wife doesn't like the story, not that she's particularly partisan to Florida, she just thinks it is a story that is not in good taste. But she isn't here, I can indulge my bad taste and tell the story anyway.

During those 11 years that I was president of Miami University, as Harold has mentioned, I found that one of the crosses I had to bear was explaining the difference, and there is some, between Miami University and The University of Miami. And I had a great amount of difficulty in many places trying to get across just exactly where Miami University was.

Fortunately, the sports writers now finally have learned the difference, and I read on the sports pages Miami of Florida and Miami of Ohio. But that doesn't do you much good unless you are a sports writer, and I had other encounters, believe it or not. This actually happened to me, and I always enjoyed the encounter.

For a number of years, I don't know whether it's still done or not, the Book-of-the-Month Club gave an annual Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award to some small rural library that had done an outstanding job in promoting reading. You can understand, of course, why the Book-of-the-Month Club would want to promote reading. And so various and sundry small communities were invited each year to submit some documentation of what they had done during

the past year in promoting reading in their community, and then a panel of judges met and the Book-of-the-Month Club announced its annual award.

The annual award for the calendar year of 1959 was given to a small, unsuspecting, sleepy Ohio rural county known as Prebble County. Now, no one will know where Prebble County is except me. Prebble County is the next county north of Butler County, and Butler County is where Miami University is located.

And so, on a cold March day in 1960, sundry assorted public relations experts from New York City descended upon this small unsuspecting rural community to have an award ceremony, presenting the Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award to the Prebble County consolidated library. (Bob, you will know where Prebble County is, it's next door to Montgomery County. And Father Roesch will also know where it is.) I was called up and asked if I'd come to the award ceremony on this March afternoon and would I come to a dinner preceding this ceremony at the Eaton Country Club.

Well, I had a trustee at Miami University who was a leading banker in Prebble County and Eaton, and I was one of these peculiar college presidents who thought trustees were important and that it was a good idea to worry about the tender care of trustees, and I decided I'd show up on this Sunday afternoon to witness this awards ceremony, and I said, sure I'd come along.

Well, at this luncheon at the Eaton Country Club I found myself seated across the table from Mr. Harry Sherman, the chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-Month Club. Mr. Sherman and I were at a little bit of a disadvantage to know exactly how to begin a conversation. Finally Mr. Sherman leaned across the table, and he said to me, "Mr. Millett, I didn't get where you are from." I said, "Mr. Sherman, I'm from Miami University." "My," said Mr. Sherman, "it was nice of you to come such a distance." I said, "Yes, Mr. Sherman, twenty miles."

It was the beginning of a warm friendship. *(Laughter)* Having lived for nineteen years myself in New York City and knowing the New Yorker's concept of the map of the United States, I decided that Mr. Sherman had it coming with both barrels blazing, so I said, "Yes, Mr. Sherman, as a matter of fact last year Miami University celebrated its 150th anniversary. In fact, when Miami University was founded Florida belonged to Spain, and there have been many times when I have regretted the change of status." And,

I'm not sure he even knew about Spain. *(Laughter)* But he knew that Miami University was only twenty miles from Eaton. And I've had lots of wonderful experiences of this kind at various and sundry times. I was reminded the other day — I know that it's inevitable that anything I say tonight, I'll step on somebody's toes. I think it's inevitable. Harold refers to scars. But lots of times, you know the amazing thing is you really don't intend to step on people: somebody just puts on the shoe and decides it fits. Which reminds me of another story.

Back in 1949 I was asked to do a study for the Association of American Universities. I couldn't think of a good excuse not to, so I got involved, and unfortunately that was my beginning in getting involved in higher education. (Before that I had been a professor; that's not being involved in higher education, that's being comfortable.) The business manager of Columbia University called me up one day and said, John, "The Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers will be holding its annual meeting in January down at Atlantic City. We'd like for you to come along and tell us about this study you are making for the Association of American Universities with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation."

Well, I was a peculiar professor. Even as a peculiar president, I thought business managers were important. Emerson Gensler was a friend of mine, and I said, "Well, if you want me to come down, sure I'll come down and make a talk. But really I haven't gone far enough in my study to be able to say anything."

"Well, that's not important;" Emerson said, "really what the business managers want, they just want to see you. They want to see what kind of horns you wear. They want to know what you look like, that's all. You can say anything you want to, it doesn't make a bit of difference."

Well, I thought that was easy, just like talking to you this evening, and so I said, "Sure, I'll come down." (It was even colder on that January evening down in Atlantic City than that March day I remember at Eaton, Ohio.) So I went down and was duly introduced to a group of business officers in the Eastern Association, and I started in.

I told them a little bit about the origins of this study that was being sponsored by the Association of American Universities, explained once again I really didn't have anything to say. Then I

thought, well, I've got to do something that's a little bit complimentary to this group of men — no women business officers then, I think there are some now, but there weren't then. I said I had gone far enough, as a matter of fact in visiting a number of campuses, that I had encountered some criticism of business officers. I had encountered the criticism on a number of campuses that business officers exercised an undue influence, indeed a particular amount of power in the decision-making process on college and university campuses. I then went ahead to say that I thought this was an unfair criticism, I thought it was probably true that there were occasions when business officers did exercise very substantial decision-making authority in a college or university but that I had come to the conclusion that where this was the case it was because there was a vacuum of academic power in the community, and if the president didn't do the job and the academic vice president didn't do the job, somebody sure as hell had to, and it fell to the unfortunate lot of the business manager to step into the vacuum and make decisions.

I then proceeded to describe in some detail, without mentioning any names, Columbia University under President Eisenhower, with which I happened to be familiar. I thought it was a pretty decent speech, if I do say so. I thought I was being complimentary. I finished, and there was polite, not too enthusiastic, applause. I sat down, and for the first and only time it has ever happened in a good deal of public speaking I have done, a man sitting right down here where Mr. Thomas is comes running up, grabs the p.a. microphone, because he thinks these remarks of Professor Millett should not go unnoticed: they ought to be commented upon. He wanted everybody in that room to understand he resented every single comment Professor Millett had made. He wanted to be clear about that. He was insulted: indeed he was more than that. Professor Millet had just insulted the University of Pennsylvania and President Stassen. *(Laughter)* And that actually happened. So, if the shoe fits, put it on, but don't blame me.

I want to say a few things about the urban university. My definition of the urban university may or not be the one you use or entirely appropriate, but I think of the urban university as the university *in* and *of* the urban community.

I don't know what's the best way to make a contrast with the urban university. The easy, obvious one, of course, is to put in juxtaposition the urban university and the non-urban university. So I'm tempted to be beyond that and speak of the urban univer-

sity and the traditional university. But I think of the urban university as the institution in American higher education that has seen its educational mission in terms of serving the needs of the immediate urban community of which it's a part. And this is not the mission of the traditional college or university.

There are a good many universities in this country located in urban cities but not *of* the urban community. The most obvious ones I can think of are Harvard and M.I.T., which are in Cambridge, but they surely are not *of* Boston and Cambridge. Or Brown University in Providence, or Columbia University in New York City, or the University of Chicago in Chicago, and some others.

I am now reminded of another anecdote — I almost spent five minutes without one.

Again, in this study that I was mentioning for the Association of American Universities, I used the first year mostly as an occasion to visit various campuses that as a professor I had never had the opportunity to visit before. The three men who dominated the Association of American Universities in those days, Harold, were Henry Wriston of Brown, Fred Middlebush of the University of Missouri, Jim Conant of Harvard. There was never any gathering of any kind, I can assure you, in which Henry Wriston was present that he didn't dominate. If it was the Association of American Colleges or the ACE you should have been around to watch George Zuch and Henry Wriston tangle. Henry Wriston's greatest goal was to make sure that George Zuch never had anything really important to do in the American Council, and I might add he damn well succeeded. Poor old George! And then Fred Middlebush was an awful good end man, and of course Jim Conant was an individual all his own. Then Conant left a great deal of his endeavors to his provost, who was Paul Buck.

I made a number of visits and came back to report to my committee of twelve men, and Wriston and Paul Buck in particular were kind of critical of my visiting schedule. They said, "John, all you're doing is visiting the members of the Association. Don't you think it's time you saw a second-drawer institution?" (I like that — that's all right — typical of AAU). And I said, "Well, I'd been going to prestigious institutions." They wanted me to see some others kinds of institutions.

So the next time I had a commission meeting, about three months later, I was ready for my commission members and I said, "Now I've really seen a second-drawer institution."

Well, of course the moment I said that they wanted to know which one was it, and they wanted a description. "Well," I said, "it was Boston University." And I felt entitled to make a few critical comments about Boston University. It's sponsored by the Methodist Church, or was, and I'm supposed to be a good Methodist. (The president was a district superintendent, former one, of the Methodist Church. I've never had much respect for district superintendents, they're just one notch above or below — I've never quite been able to decide — a Methodist bishop. And I think about Methodist bishops what state university presidents in Ohio think about a chancellor.) So I proceeded to describe what I'd found at Boston University under this district superintendent, and I described it, I thought, in substantial, gory detail.

It was one of my early days when I had not yet understood very much about urban universities. Whenl I got all through I was very interested in what happened — I never forgot the lesson I learned. First Henry Wriston jumped on me and then Paul Buck on me. They said, "John, you've missed the whole point of your visit."

I looked a little surprised.

They said, "You really haven't seen Boston University. All you saw was that district superintendent. You never got over your reactions to the district superintendent. You didn't see Boston University in terms of what it does for Boston."

And then Paul Buck spoke up and said, "I want you to understand that without Boston University it would be impossible for Harvard to exist."

I never forgot that observation. But, on the other hand, when that district superintendent retired two years later and I saw that Harvard University, with Paul Buck as acting president, had given him an honorary degree, I couldn't help having a little fun. So the next time I saw Paul Buck, who was a prestigious graduate of Ohio State University, I said, "Paul, it's wonderful. I see you gave an honorary degree to my friend the district superintendent."

Paul just grinned a little bit about it.

And I wasn't above having a little more fun, and I said "You know, Paul, what I thought of when I read it in the *New York Times*, I thought to myself, even Harvard is not above buying protection." *(Laughter)* It made me very popular, as usual.

But there's a good lesson here, and an important one. With all due respects to both M.I.T. and Harvard, Boston University, Boston College, Northeastern University had rendered a vital service obviously to the urban community that was never the role, or certainly not the role in recent years, of either of these other two institutions.

The urban university has as one of its activities obviously enrolling the part-time student, providing educational opportunity for the person who is employed in the community and wishes to advance his competence in the profession where he is employed or to advance himself in a new profession.

I've had a lot of arguments in the last few years about the virtues and defects of a part-time student body. I've become convinced over the years that part-time students are good students. But most faculty members of the traditional university are convinced that the part-time student is an abomination.

I think my friend from the University of Cincinnati is not here, so it's safe for me to use an illustration from Cincinnati. One of the problems I had at Miami and then later at Columbus had to do with a night law school in Cincinnati. I thought there was an easy solution to the night law school in Cincinnati. The American Bar Association was insisting it had to become affiliated with a university. I thought the easy solution was to have it taken over by the University of Cincinnati. But believe you me that law school faculty wasn't about to take on a part-time law school.

I got all kinds of arguments . . . I didn't believe in part-time education of doctors, did I? (I never did find out exactly what relevance that had. But that was the argument that was used on me.) And I believed that legal education was important, didn't I? I believed that doctors ought to be well educated, didn't I? All these things meant they had to be full-time students, and if you took part-time students you obviously took lousy students.

I never believed this. When I was on the graduate faculty of Columbia, I was on of the very few members of the graduate faculty in the social sciences who would conduct courses in the late afternoon and evening. I never thought it was particularly beneath my diginity. And anyway I had some wonderful students that way — some students over the years that I have been delighted to keep in touch with. My prize one is the budget director today of the State of Isreal, who was then working for the United Nations. We have some interesting correspondence.

But, in any event, I couldn't see this argument that part-time students are lousy students.

The argument was they work all day and they are tired, they can't spend the necessary time in the library, they can't read all the materials that you want them to read, they just come and sit in lecture and try their best to pass the course.

I never found it that way in my own experience, and I'm still not convinced. But I am convinced that we're probably going to have more part-time students, not fewer, in the years that lie immediately ahead — in the next ten years.

And I'm convinced that we're going to have more students coming in and out of our colleges, not finishing four years. We are going to have more students, as suggested in the Newman Report, that will be coming to certain colleges, staying awhile, dropping out and then returning. I don't look upon this with fear or regret: I look upon it with anticipation and expectation. I think these students will be good students, desirable students. They can do a great deal to make our instructional programs much richer for the experience they will bring to bear and the interest, the relevance they'll see in the studies they undertake.

When I started in as a st[illegible] higher education planner in 1964, it seemed interesting to me [illegible] realize that in the state-supported higher education system that existed in 1964, we had one university in a major urban community, *one* public university. The other four universities had all been located in the traditional manner in some out-of-the-way community, of which the prize was Oxford, Ohio, where I discovered you could neither get in nor get out. (So I asked the university to buy an airplane.) But this was the typical pattern in the creation of our state universities in America, to locate them for the most part in some out-of-the-way small community.

Look at it all over the country, you see the consequences. How many state universities, the leading research universities of the country, have been located in major urban communities? I think you can count them on one hand.

It seems to me that there were two basic reasons why the public universities had to move into major urban communities. One obvious reason was that was where the students were. Some time, some place we had to begin to understand that America had be-

come an urban society. There was another reason, an obvious reason, a political reason, and that was that if public higher education expected public support, it seemed to be obvious that it was going to get it out of urban communities, not out of rural communities. And that's become even more true with Supreme Court decisions about reapportionment.

So we begin the thrust in Ohio. Where we had six state universities we now have twelve, and the six new institutions were all in large urban areas. Three other municipal institutions, originally private colleges that have become municipal universities, then came into the state system. The other three: one created new, the other two growing up out of YMCA institutions . . .

(By the way, I can't understand why some historian of American higher education has never looked at what the YMCA did in behalf of urban higher education in America. This is an untold story. If there is a book on the subject, it has escaped my attention. I've never found it. But it's a vastly interesting story, and it's a story about the neglect of higher education by our state universities, our state governments, and it's a story of neglect by others and the vacuum that was filled by this effort. I still think it's worthy of some very good, careful investigation and reporting.)

But, in any event, beyond these twelve institutions — six new ones — we moved then also into the two-year campuses, thirty-five of them now in Ohio. They're all located for the most part, with the exception of those in Appalachian, Ohio, in fairly substantial communities. But the moment we began the expansion of public higher education into urban communities, we suddenly realized that we had created a new problem for ourselves, a problem, frankly, that I hadn't given sufficient attention to, and the only excuse that I can offer for it is that I think there were some other planners who didn't either. I don't know what, constructively, I can say about the conflict between public and private institutions in our urban communities. I can only say it exists, it's there, and I personally think it's the number one item on the unfinished agenda of higher education in America. I don't see any easy solutions, I wish I did. There have been various and sundry proposals. I have made mine. (Lots of people didn't like them.) Others have made theirs. I'm a little amused at some of the experiences we have had.

One answer, in a good many cases, has been for private institutions to become part of a public system, and I think this possibility ought not to be overlooked or passed by.

Another possibility is public support, state government support, of the private institutions. This has gone fartherest to date in New York State under the Bundy Law, as it's called. I was talking the other day with a trustee of Reade College in Oregon, and he was telling me that Oregon in the 1971 legislature passed a law that now gives $300 per student for Oregon students enrolled in the private colleges and universities of Oregon. I see nothing wrong with this proposal except the problem of taxation and spending by our state governments.

The private colleges and universities in New York put out a report this summer in which they asked for substantial increase in state government support in New York State, and I don't see the slightest chance that this can be done in the 1973 legislature in New York, simply because of the horrendous fiscal situation that confronts the State of New York. And I'm sure you couldn't have a governor more sympathetic to the cause of private higher education than Governor Nelson Rockefeller, and I'm equally sure that he's exhausted the tax capacity of the State of New York. (You ought to see the bumper stickers on this subject around New York on this one.)

I think there are other possibilities we are going to have to explore. I've talked about increasing the charges of the public institutions, because at least that doesn't cost the taxpayers anything. This, of course, violates the long traditions of the land grant movement in this country in public higher education, and it creates another problem that I just don't think we can overlook, and that's the problem of the middle income family in America, the families with incomes from the median in our country today, which is around $10,500 of family income up to around $20,000 a year. I think the cost of higher education for these families is very substantial indeed, and the public system of higher education has in large part responded to these needs. It's tremendously important what they have done here. These families don't want public aid; they are a little leery of state scholarships or any other scholarships that are based not upon merit but based upon family income, and I just think we can't ignore this segment of the American population, which to a very substantial extent thinks it's being neglected, overlooked, or ignored in the political battles of our day.

I encountered before I left Ohio one of the most interesting solutions I've come across that had been dreamed up in one private college. I don't know if this has ever been written up, I don't think it's very well known. I don't know how applicable it would be to any other situation, but I thought it was a remarkable solution. This

was in a county just outside of Cleveland where there's a women's college, very good, small women's college, selected admission and all, high cost (an all-inclusive student fee for room, board and tuition being around $4,500). The president had recommended to his board of trustees that the college become co-educational. The board of trustees decided they didn't want to do this, so the president had to dream up something new. I thought he dreamed up a wonderful device. He created a new college, with a new title, Garfield College, because James Garfield came from this county.

Garfield College is an upper-division, co-ed college, with a $1,500 a year tuition. You can only enroll at the junior year level. But when you enroll your classes are the classes of the other college; no new faculty members, no new classes, just a new college, granting degrees, with a co-educational student body mixed in with the girls. As far as I can tell (this is its third year this fall), it's doing very well. They've brought a whole new substantial source of income to this college.

I would like to think that there could be other means of cooperation. I've thought of the possibility that we might be able to arrange joint graduate programs. I think we are going to have to expand graduate education, not contract it, in our major urban areas. I remind you that the National Science Board in January 1969 published a report in which it suggested that there ought to be a major comprehensive graduate program in every urban community of 500,000 population or more. And I am disposed to think this was a wise recommendation.

(I can assure you the AAU doesn't approve of it. I sit with the national board on graduate education where I'm the gadfly, the only person who takes on representatives there of the AAU. They are all sick and tired of me; they're going to be sicker and tireder before we are through. But I consider that I was put there solely to annoy the representatives from Harvard, which I always love to do, Pennsylvania, Stanford, and a few other places, Chicago, etc. Nobody there from Columbia, that's too bad. I'm tempted to say something about my Harvard friends who had so much fun telling me in April 1968 that it couldn't happen at Harvard.)

But, I think we are going to have to expand, not contract, graduate education in major urban areas. I'd like to see public and private institutions, where it's appropriate and possible, join together in doing this. I think it is possible. I think graduate education and graduate professional education are too costly to be supported

from student fees alone, probably too costly to be supported with endowment and gift income, except in a few favorable situations. I'm certainly convinced that this is true of medical education. I don't believe any private institution, including Columbia, can today support a medical school without government underwriting. And I think there may very well be other graduate and graduate-professional programs where this is going to have to be equally the case.

But somehow, in some way, maybe not in any one simple way — and I haven't mentioned scholarship programs and grant programs; I think these too are very important — somehow, some way, we're going to have to find a method of resolving this matter of conflict in urban communities between our public and private institutions.

Of course, there's another possibility for the private institution in the urban community, and that is for the private institution to decide that it doesn't want to be an urban university, as I have described it here this evening, but to be simply a university in an urban setting but not *of* the urban community.

One last item I want to say a word or two about on the urban university and its relationship to the urban community. One of the things I heard a great deal about as a state higher education planner was the whole subject of urban extension. I was always intrigued by this, although having known a good deal about the politics of agricultural extension, I also had some reservations about it. (Incidentally, there is a marvelous law suit now filed in the District of Columbia suing all the land grant colleges and the Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Stations for being allied politically with only one segment of the farm population of this country. That's going to be a great law suit, and I'm delighted to sit on the sidelines and watch this one and see what becomes of it.)

I've listened for a long, long time, for forty years, to those accusations and about the relationship of the Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Stations to a particular segment of the agricultural community. And I've listened to the defense of our agricultural educators, and they have a strong defense that they offer, which is that they can only do so much with their efforts, and after all they can't control who listens to them and who then profits from the listening. I think this is a pretty good defense. But I've been worried about urban extension in terms of the political neutrality of a university.

You may or may not agree with me on this subject, but I feel strongly that all of our universities in this country must remain politically neutral in a pluralistic society, that they cannot afford to become allies of a particular interest group, *any* particular interest group, or *any* particular segment of the political spectrum in our country. Rather, it seems to me what the urban university is obliged to do is to offer its services to all interest groups, to all voluntary associations, all segments of the political spectrum who want assistance, want information. But how it is used and what is accomplished with that use should certainly not be tagged on the urban university.

Now, maybe this careful dividing line is not realistic, but I think it is. I think it is more than a matter of realism, I think it's a matter of the essential nature of a university in our society. I think unless we're prepared to maintain that political neutrality, we align the university inevitably with a particular segment of society. Then the future of that university, of any university, of all of higher education, is tied with the political fate of the group with which it becomes aligned. (This is the accusation that is made in this law suit against the land grant colleges and universities, the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and the Extension Service, that is politically aligned with the American Farm Bureau Federation and not with the farmers' union or with Chavez or with other groups struggling in the agricultural arena today. I can't help but feel that the land grant institutions will win this conflict; I think they can and will prove their political neutrality. But I think there is a lesson to be learned here for the urban universities. I think they would do well to take it to heart.)

So, as I look at the higher education scene for the next ten years, I think the urban universities are where the action is. I think it will be increasingly so. I think the prospects and possibilities of the urban universities have never been brighter. Now we shall have to learn how to resolve the public-private conflict, we shall have to learn how to enforce and make real the political neutrality of the urban university; but I think we'll find ways to do this. I think we can find ways, I think we will. It isn't going to be easy, but then I don't know anything that's easy any more. I don't see any reason why we should be so worried about this.

I remember only too well the conclusions that Arnold Toynbee reached in his monumental study of history, that civilizations died when they no longer had a creative response to challenge. I like that phrase "creative response to challenge." I don't have any

worry about the challenge for the urban university, and I trust the response over the next decade will indeed be creative.

Thank you. *(Applause)*

President Enarson: John, on behalf of my colleagues in the Association, wives and guests, I want to thank you for reminding us in such clear and succinct fashion why this association exists, why urban universities continue to be something special under the sun. You also have given us at least part of the necessary agenda for tomorrow, and I hope that we are capable of a creative response which, frankly, I find to be extraordinarily difficult at breakfast. But I think that's when we are beginning, as I recall.

I'm wondering, Bob, do you have any announcements about relevant materials, such as what do we have for breakfast, and where we foregather, and what do you expect to contribute to the process?

President Spiro: Will you ask Miss Jarrell to comment?

President Enarson: That's what I call delegation. Now you just saw delegation. Miss Jarrell.

Miss Marion Jarrell: Nothing except what's in the program, and I'm pretty sure it's eggs. *(Laughter)*

President Enarson: Tom Van Arsdale, is it eggs or not?

Chancellor T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr.: Gee, I don't know, but I'll tell you this: I would hope that John might stay over for breakfast and visit with us, however briefly.

President Enarson: John, I think you have to leave at tennish, or so, but we surely do want to have you with us if it's humanly possible.

Dr. Millett: I thought you'd suffered long enough.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I think we have a couple questions we would like to ask him.

President Enarson: Great. Is there anything anybody wants to bring before the group before we adjourn? If not, we stand adjourned.

GENERAL AND BUSINESS SESSIONS

Monday, November 6, 1972

The general and business sessions of the annual meeting were held in the Georgia Room of the Jacksonville Hilton Hotel, Jacksonville, Florida. The general session was called to order at 10:00 a.m., Monday, November 6, 1972, by President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, who presided.

President Enarson: I would like to call this general session of the annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities to order.

I think one of the distinctive features of this educational conference that I most enjoy, apart from its brevity, is the informal discussions which have long characterized the organization. This open and candid and frank exchange at the breakfast sessions is something which we presidents all too rarely have the opportunity to do in any of the other major professional organizations.

In our group this morning we ranged the cosmos, as we usually do, and again, as we usually do, came back to central key problems and opportunities that have engaged our attention and have afflicted us lo these many years. I won't preview those discussions because they will be covered in the report of the breakfast sessions in a few moments.

You will have noted that the attendance is somewhat down from last year, and that's very likely the consequence of, one weak institutional leadership on the part of the president, not the vice president, Father Raynor; secondly, budgetary limitations, which we are told are now indemic throughout the land; and thirdly, I suspect simply that the times are less feverish and people are a little bit more inclined to stay on the home campus.

The first item of business this morning is the matter of membership applications, and I'd like to call upon Bob Spiro, our secretary-treasurer for a report.

President Spiro: Mr. Chairman, according to our bylaws, institutions may seek application, and of course we have been active in looking for new members. During the past few years the numbers have grown from about 107 to the present membership of 123

institutional memberships. According to our bylaws, an institution must be accredited, must seek membership, and its chief executive officer must be present to attain membership. I would like to nominate two institutions for membership: the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, in Charlotte, N.C. (The chancellor is Dean W. Colvert. He is here today and we are so pleased to have him as our guest in our city and as a delegate to these meetings.), and the University of Michigan at Dearborn, which has as its chancellor Leonard E. Goodall, who is here today too. I would like to call on these two gentlemen, Chancellor Colvert and Chancellor Goodall to stand and let us see them. Then I hereby move that these two institutions having met the standards for admission be admitted. Thank you, gentlemen. *(Applause)*

President Enarson: Is there a second to that motion? It has been moved and seconded. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Enarson: The record is unanimous. We are delighted to have you gentlemen with us, and we know we're going to enjoy our association with you, and we hope that this will be reciprocal.

The next item is the report of our secretary-treasurer, and I hasten to assure you that his report will be followed immediately by that of the auditing committee.

President Spiro: Mr. Chairman, my report this year will be quite brief. I would like first to read to you a telegram that was received in my office Friday from Martin Meyerson, president of the University of Pennsylvania:

> Deeply regret that my immediate colleagues and I are not able to be at the AUU meeting in Jacksonville this year. Best wishes.

We appreciate his greetings and regret that the University of Pennsylvania is not represented this year.

I'd like to indicate to you that at the last meeting the membership consisted of 123. Two new members have applied, and you have just admitted them, making a total of 125. During the course of the year we have had resignations from five, leaving us a net membership of 120. I indicate that this is an increase of some 13

from two years ago. At that time we constituted a membership committee and wrote and indicated the interest of the Association of Urban Universities in a number of new urban institutions, and some of the older ones, and we acquired members.

Our dues are quite modest, $75 per year. Five institutions who have asked not to be continued all pleaded financial exigency. And as president of a largely unendowed very non-profit private institution, I was quite fascinated by the fact that one of the five that indicated financial exigency was Vanderbilt University. So I would like publicly here to express my good will to Vanderbilt and hope that they will manage to survive their crisis. *(Laughter)* I do imagine that the matter of budgetary squeeze is significant, not only for all of us represented here but for all of our members, as for much of American higher education. In most cases budgets are not being cut, as I see it at least, as much as progress in many directions. The increase to which we have all become accustomed in enrollment and other measures of our development have been slowed.

But in any case this organization of urban universities was founded in 1914, interestingly enough, and has grown very slowly through the years, and has sought to wrestle with the problems of urban institutions through our brief meetings, our breakfast sessions, and our informal discussions by which we compare notes and brag a little bit and weep on each others' shoulders. All these considerations have characterized the Association of Urban Universities during the years.

You will hear a report on our own finances, and happily this organization is solvent, and I'll leave the report to the auditing committee on that score. Mr. Chairman, that's the substance of my brief report this year.

President Enarson: Thank you, Bob. We now await with avid interest the report of the auditing committee, which is chaired by that financial genius, Tom Van Arsdale. Because of our great confidence in him, we also attached to the committee a colleague, Bill Hazel, to watch you. *(Laughter)* With that expression of confidence in the auditors, may we have the auditing report?

Chancellor Van Arsdale: Well, I think we can afford to be cheeful, because coincidentally, Bill Hazel and I found out that the books, including the check stubs, and so on, all agree with the financial report, which has been included with your materials, and we are solvent. There is a balance of $5,495, or there was up until

October 31st. There have been no expenditures since then, but I think they are imminent. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the auditing committee finds that the books are in order, that the people managing them are honest to a surprising degree, and we suggest that you accept our word on it.

President Enarson: Is there a motion to accept the report? Seconded. All those in favor of the motion to accept the report as submitted will indicate by saying "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Enarson: Those opposed, "no." The motion is carried.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: Was that unanimous?

President Enarson: I thought it was overwhelmingly unanimous. The record should show thunderous support.

The next item on the program indicates resolutions, and I am wondering if the spirit will move our colleague, Joe Klotsche.

Chancellor J. Martin Klotsche: About five minutes after ten this morning, Harold asked me if I would serve as chairman of the Resolutions Committee. I pleaded ignorance and said that I had never been on a resolutions committee, and he said "Neither have I." So in order to reinforce our positions I asked for the summary of the proceedings of the Miami conference in the hope that this would be helpful in guiding us in this important task.

I discovered much to my amusement and interest that the chairman of the Resolutions Committee at the Miami meeting was none other than Harold Enarson, *(Laughter)*, and that the other member of the committee was Joe Klotsche. *(Laughter)* In our task we were very ably supported by Phil Hoffman who, unfortunately, had to leave the city this morning.

As a matter of just historical interest, I simply point out that the Miami summary of proceedings indicates that the committee, which consisted of Harold Enarson, Joe Klotsche, and Phil Hoffman, drafted in the early light of dawn four resolutions. There was a fifth resolution that the Resolutions Committee considered at the Miami convention, and I'm now reading from the record: these are actual historical facts. There was a motion for a fifth resolution, the Miami document says, but it lost on two-to-one vote: it was a resolution of appreciation to the hotel *(Laughter)*, but the chair-

man (that was Harold Enarson) and at least one other member of the group (that was Joe Klotsche) were required to pay cash on the barrel head before they registered, and the motion lost on the ground two-to-one. *(Laughter)*

Now with that background, I do not have a set of resolutions to offer, but I do think it would be appropriate to go on record, Mr. Chairman, having this Association go on record as expressing its appreciation to a number of people who have been responsible for the success of this two-day meeting. Certainly we would want to express our appreciation to Jacksonville University for the wonderful tour which was given us yesterday afternoon, including the tour of the campus, followed, of course, by the very kind reception which was offered by, Bob, you and your wife, and we would want certainly the record to show our appreciation for that. We would also want our resolution to show appreciation for the faithful manner in which the officers of this Association have conducted their affairs, including the management of this conference. (Don't look so surprised). We appreciate that very much, and also, Bob Spiro, for the manner in which you have served as custodian of the daily affairs of this Association, including the management of its vast investment portfolio. And, of course, to Marion Jarrell and George Flowers, who have been really responsible for doing the day-to-day important work of this Association. We would also want to express appreciation to John Millett who, unfortunately, has now left, but who gave us a very fine talk yesterday evening, as well as all the other participants of the Association.

I'm sorry I have nothing to hand to you in writing, but I would like to make a motion that this Association express its appreciation to the people defined in this manner, and in the manner which has been set forth here, and I so move, Mr. Chairman.

President Enarson: You have heard the composite motion, which will be spelled out beautifully in the English language at a later date. Is there a second to the conglomerate motion?

Unidentified Delegate: Second.

President Enarson: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor indicate by saying "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Enarson: The motion carries. Thank you very much.

We will now have a report of the Nominating Committee, which consisted of Lloyd Elliott, Phil Hoffman, and Father Carron. Two of the three members have long since departed from the city, leaving this enviable task to Father Carron.

President Malcolm Carron, S.J.: I don't know if it was a two-to-one vote or what. *(Laughter)* We'll never know. This committee met in early dawn, about five til eight, and did its work. The committee recommends, Mr. Chairman, that Father John P. Raynor, president of Marquette, be elevated to the presidency of this Association, and that Dr. James C. Olson, Chancellor of the University of Missouri, Kansas City, become vice president. Just as a matter of record, the secretary-treasurer's job stays with Bob Spiro, who was elected to a three-year term last year. So, I move the adoption of this report.

President Enarson: You have heard the motion to adopt the report. Is there a second to that motion?

Unidentified Delegate: Second.

President Enarson: Are you ready for the question? All in favor of the motion as stated will indicate by saying "Aye."

The Delegates: Aye.

President Enarson: All those opposed, "no." The motion carries, and with it, Father Raynor, all of the onerous duties, rights, and privileges attached thereto. I do have my suspicions about the investment portfolio. It's entirely possible that we are investing in South Africa, and I think any diligent president clearly ought to look into it immediately! *(Laughter)* That's my advice to you, sir. There ought to be some chance for a president to give advice to somebody on something at some time. *(Laughter)*

President John P. Raynor, S.J.: Thank you. When is the next meeting?

President Enarson: The next item is new business. The floor is open to any item of new business.

Dr. Charles Johnson: Dr. Warren Bennis, the president of the University of Cincinnati, has extended an invitation to this Association to have its next session in Cincinnati. He has consulted

with the Netherland Hilton Hotel. I think it would like to host the meeting next year.

President Enarson: Thank you very much, Dr. Johnson, for that invitation. Are there any other people who are frenzied and frantic to have us visit next year? If not, it is my understanding that the Executive Committee takes this offer into account, and by a process that will never be known to the membership, reaches a decision on it at a subsequent date.

At this time I am very pleased to turn to Father Raynor, who will lead us in a review of this morning's breakfast sessions.

President Raynor: Thanks, Harold. Just as a result of my electioneering, I want you to know that I'm pleased to be president of this Association in the course of the next year and look forward to the work with eager enthusiasm.

Looking to the program itself, I see on the middle page of the layout here that I have been coordinator of discussion topics, and we have had the discussions this morning. Presidents these days are supposed to be creative persons, coming up with all types of new ideas. I think in giving my instructions to the discussion leaders I combined not only the creativity that a president is supposed to have but also some my own philosophical background that may be highly platonic and unreal, looking at the world of beauty and ideas and ideals. And so I asked them, in terms of John Millett's talk last night, and especially a quote that he used at the end, to kind of set up their discussions accordingly.

Millett told us that civilizations die when they no longer have a creative response to challenges. So I thought that these would be three good topics to look at in the course of this morning's discussions: what are the main challenges to the urban university as such; secondly, what are some appropriate responses; and thirdly, what can we do to insure our creativity in the future as urban universities in looking at these problems?

At this point in our program we have an opportunity to find out how philosophical I have been, and specifically we return to the real world and find out what really happened this morning. In order to achieve this, I want to call on the discussion leaders to come up one by one and give us a brief report on what transpired during their sessions. At the outset I want to thank them, namely Father

Mal Carron, Tom Van Arsdale, and Don Guzzetta, for taking on these onerous assignments and leading the discussions this morning. I'm very appreciative of your cooperation with the coordinator of discussion topics. So, let's start with Group 1, which met in Duval A this morning, discussion leader Father Malcolm Carron of the University of Detroit. Father Carron.

President Carron: Thank you. Our group, I think, was a little long on bringing the problems out and a little short on the solutions, but I'll say this for us, we did stick to a couple of topics and these were the basic challenges I think that we find among our universities today. Certainly the first one that came up is very true, especially for the urban university. It is the kind of new clientele that we relate to these days. We're dealing principally with a much more mature kind of student, an adult type student, in many instances and to a large extent in urban universities a part-time student, one who desn't go full-time, a non-residential student and sometimes a residential student, and lastly we're getting a veteran into our ranks again in increasing numbers.

We felt that in many respects, the community colleges were ahead of us in dealing with this new kind of clientele, but willy-nilly still up to us to meet the challenge. And it was really a question of different ways in which you can help these students, teach them, instruct them through counseling perhaps, special kinds of counseling and special techniques. Into this picture naturally came the faculty, who I'm sure do not overtly resist the challenge but at the same time are often less than adept at meeting it.

We also noted as a second kind of challenge, and this is going to be obvious to all, the questions of finances. It was pretty much agreed that we're entering a new era of real cost accountability and that we're going to be much less casual in our approach to the financing of our institutions — much more questioning, many more efforts to find true efficiency. Into this came a very relevant question about possibly an increased cost, or at least different kinds of costs, for the urban university as opposed to the residential campus. You know, such things as the land acquisition question, parking questions, questions of security. Also, in the business of somehow relating ourselves to this new clientele and the new instructional challenge that we meet, is the question again of money. I don't think there is anybody here that would deny that innovation is often a very expensive kind of proposition if you really know what you are doing and if you try to get down to the guts of what you have been doing in the past — a change, for in-

stance, of taking out a requirement, has some very difficult financial implications. You might suddenly find yourself not needing a half-tenured department or not needing as many people in that department. But these things have to be faced.

Finally, relating to both of these questions was the question of faculty morale. And we noted that here you have all kinds of things impinging on the faculty — internal pressures as well as external, the fact that they are facing new questions about their job security, the question of the whole concept of the urban kind of university as opposed to the traditional. You know many of us haven't quite clarified for our faculties what all this means to them, and this has gotten to be a rather difficult problem — the question that faculties are facing an unpredictable situation, sometimes day to day and many times in their whole lives.

So this, in summary, was what we stuck to pretty much as we went through the very pleasant and, I think, very profitable two-hour discussion. Thank you.

President Raynor: I think the best way, at least one way, to go about this this morning is to have the three chairmen give their reports and then have a broad discussion of various topics that have interested you in the terms of the reports. Let's move on to Tom Van Arsdale at this time. He was in charge of Group 2. Tom.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I liked your use, Father Raynor, of the phrase "in charge of." It was readily evident that I was not in charge as soon as we got under way, because we did, all of us, I think, participate. We soon addressed ourselves to the urban university, but also to the implications of public and private, and someone even used the phrase public *versus* private. This was good, because we had a good mix so far as resources were concerned and so far as the character of our institutions was concerned.

We learned readily that all of us wanted to cooperate, all of us wanted to participate with other institutions in doing the best job that we could in terms of our own strengths. But how to do it? Consortia, of course, was mentioned, and that very remarkable group the Higher Education Coordinating Council in St. Louis. We heard about its history of being formed, or initiated, some ten years ago, but really becoming effective perhaps within the last five years when the various member institutions (and there are twelve of them in the St. Louis area) began to define very honestly and can-

didly what they considered their roles to be as individual institutions of higher education.

I was struck by the dedication of those twelve institutions and the addition of six public members and even representatives from the high schools in the area, because, believe it or not, this Council meets once a month, the last Saturday morning of the month. I consider that real dedication. Anybody who would get up and spend Saturday morning doing that has to be dedicated to doing a good job.

Notably, and certainly it stuck out for all of us, was the fact that they do have joint programs now operating, particularly at the graduate level. Further they have been working on the use of libraries by all constituencies, and interestingly enough they have successfully included the several commercial libraries or corporate libraries in the general St. Louis area. We also understand that their long-range planning by the four universities concerned, as with certain books and periodicals which are not often used but which are very expensive and very necessary to have some day are about to be pooled in a central location in a warehouse. Incidentally, I want to add one more thing that we found very interesting in our group, and that is that this particular coordinating council actually is not only public and private but also extends across state lines. It includes southern Illinois. And I think this is important because, as I understand it, S.I.U. is only about twenty minutes from downtown St. Louis.

A natural transition occurred in our discussion into the role of the state boards of higher education, what their roles should be, how much or to what extent should they have statuatory powers and what should those powers be. And we went on to talk about planning, which would involve, we thought, should involve the public and the private institutions. Of course, several of us were interested in what's going on in the state plans for financial assistance to the private institutions, whether by subsidy or through scholarship programs or whatever. I think it was generally acknowledged that from the point of view of the private institutions, the Illinois plan seems to be the most generous and one which involves good accountability.

And when we got into accountability, we arrived at some sort of consensus which would be that so far as the private institutions are concerned, recognizing the need for accountability for any state funds which come to us, that the best means of carrying this out

is probably contract for services. This most of us seemed to like best, both private and public.

At one instance in our discussion it was noted that it is very difficult when one has a state board of higher education with remarkable statuatory powers, sometimes to have new programs introduced, desirable as they might be. And it was indicated that in this day and age that if one wanted to get a new program, like German at a graduate level, into one's institutional program that probably the best way to do it is to characterize the course as urban German. *(Laughter)*

We had with us Dr. Charles Johnson, who has a most interesting title and responsibility, and perhaps may indicate the direction certain institutions of an urban nature may be taking. Dr. Johnson is vice president for metropolitan affairs as opposed to urban, and I think this is interesting because the word "urban" affairs may have a connotation which is no longer real or honest, and it now has become for Dr. Johnson and the University of Cincinnati the vice president for metropolitan affairs. We talked about some of the programs which had been initiated there, but Dr. Johnson feels, and I'm sure he will always feel that way, that not enough is being done in these areas.

This led to a discussion of how much should the urban universities be doing to initiate programs. It was pointed out that very often the very sponsorship by a university of certain of these metropolitan or urban programs may not be welcomed and in fact may also cost a considerable amount of money to the particular institution which seeks to initiate them. However, it was emphasized that all of us do bear a responsibility to be a part of, that is to join and bring together, leadership for such action, but whether it should be totally the initiative of the university was rather sternly debated. I think from our group we came to the conclusion . . . well I'm not sure we concluded anything really, but we did seem to have some consensus that this is a new dimension, this interface with the community. It was pointed out that to compare programs for the urban areas with the formal rural programs, or even those which we are still going on at such wealthy institutions as Ohio State in agriculture, that really the amount of money historically spent in the area of agriculture nowhere near approximates the amount of money which would be needed to do a thorough job of assistance to the metropolitan areas.

As Harold Enarson put it, I think we closed with a note of

qualified optimism, which for him defined is "without foundation." Thank you.

President Raynor: Thanks very much, Tom. Let's move on to our third reporter, then we'll get into a discussion. Dr. Don Guzzetta, please.

President D. J. Guzzetta: Father, your charge was a good one, because we all had rather interesting discussions. I am not sure that we tackled the challenges in the same way. We did come up with challenges which in other words were problems. We all cited those and we spent some time on the problems, and then as we began to try to find some solutions we thought it might be easier to go back to the problems, so we did concentrate pretty heavily on that aspect of it, as I take it the other groups did too. But our approach was a little bit different.

We started off by calling attention to a statement that John made last night on graduate education. As you will recall, he noted that he felt that the future of higher education nationally, of course, will be in the urban areas and that we had better be prepared to move along the field of graduate education. We started talking about that and we learned that it isn't an easy task to develop such programs with some of the resistance that we get from so many different circles, including the professional accrediting associations, that do not make things very easy for us.

As an example, the American Association of Law Schools . . . now we know that it is desirable to be in the club. At our institution we are in the ABA club, the American Bar Association. But as we try to get into the next level with the prestigious institutions, who feel that they are crystal pure because they do not have part-time or evening education, we find that it's hard to convince those persons who come out to talk to you about your program that our mission is slightly different, and that we must put a great deal of emphasis on part-time education and evening education. But as this one distinguished pre-examiner told me just last week from Cornell, until you get rid of your evening program you're not going to get in the club. So we came to the conclusion that if we are to maintain our identities and our responsibility and our distinction as urban universities that some of that advice and counsel we ought to put aside. And we are in agreement that one of the distinguishing features of an urban university is that we do maintain good, healthy part-time programs and evening programs. I am not so sure that the time of day has very much to do with the quality

of the program, but some of our colleagues in the traditional type institutions do believe that.

Also, we felt that the graduate education development is a sound one, particularly in view of the fact that so many two-year institutions are developing in urban areas that are taking away much of the play from the existing four-year institutions at the freshman and sophomore year level, which leaves then the existing institutions to the responsibility of handling the third year, fourth year, and graduate level. And we see that developing as a natural consequence of the availability of all kinds of educational experiences to our young people in metropolitan areas.

We also made some reference to the fact that we really know (of course those of us in administration know what needs to be done but we can't really superimpose it from our top, so it must come from the ground up, but that's sometimes a little difficult to do — but we have to convince the faculty) that as urban universities we need to develop programs in line with what the community wants, the market wants, not necessarily what the faculty wants. And that dichotomy at some institutions is a little bit greater than it should be. We need to begin paying more attention to our community needs, even though it might mean some adjustment to faculty approaches to this problem.

Well, as we began to look upon our roles, and, even at the graduate level, as to how we distinguish ourselves from the traditional type institutions, we found that there are some other obstacles that are being thrown our way by state coordinating agencies, such as one that we have in Ohio which does not look with favor upon our taking courses out into the community. Now one way in which that is discouraged, particularly at the graduate level, is that you can do that but you don't get subsidy for it. Well, that's pretty powerful resistance if you aren't going to be able to get any support for that, so we are told that unless these courses are held either at a branch campus or some other facility on your home campus that perhaps they aren't respectable either. And this is in conflict with the thinking of the urban university and why it should play a rather unique role.

Obviously, and I suspect that this happened in the other two sessions, as we began looking at the situations on our campuses and the interest of the faculty in distinguishing an urban role from the residential role, we did begin to get into a limited discussion

of some of the developments on our campuses, collective bargaining. I won't go into that because I understand that you did concentrate pretty heavily on that last year, I wasn't here at that time. But we did get some input from a couple of the institutions that are in the throes of this or that have been involved in it, and the conclusion reached is one that we have all heard before, that much of the thrust here on our campuses is coming from the younger faculty members at institutions that are relatively new, that have experienced rapid growth, etc.

Also, the problem, in terms of how faculty are responding to all of this, I think, is well founded in the fact that even though we do have a different type of institution as an urban university, we still tend to reward faculty on the same basis as the faculty are rewarded in the traditional type institution. So, what do we need to do, what is our response to be? Well, we need to find some new ways of rewarding faculties for the kinds of services that they perform in an urban university in contrast to the traditional type university, where you put a great deal of stress on publications, research, and you de-emphasize the involvement of faculty members in the community. I know we have that on our own campus, and other administrators reported that their campuses are experiencing the same kind of thing. We talk one way that yes we've got a different type institution, we have a different mission to perform, yet when it comes down to the nitty-gritty part of presenting rewards for services rendered to faculty members, we tend to get back into the traditional approach and count publications and that isn't quite the principal role of an urban university.

But what are some of the other responses that we think need to be taken into account there? There was some discussion on perhaps an increase in the number of cooperative efforts that institutions are involved in both within and outside the university, which means cross fertilization among the various disciplines, which gives the university a different flavor apart from the traditional disciplinary approach that we get in the other old line institutions, and cooperative efforts with various elements within the community. And it was brought out by one of our participants, which I think is very vital, that we tend to get carried away with new programs and we will pursue them only to the extent that we are getting outside support, then when that outside support dwindles or is terminated, we kind of shift gears into something else. Well, if it's truly worthwhile, if it's truly related to the objective of an urban university, we ought to find some way of making these unique programs that distinguish us from the others as integral parts of

the institution. Until we begin to do that we really aren't performing our unique function as urban universities.

We also noted that perhaps during these times of turmoil and the threats of collective bargaining that maybe we ought to look at new ways of governing our institutions. It was pointed out that there are some administrative risks in this, but perhaps involvement of the faculty in helping us reallocate our resources and involving the total academic community in doing this might make them a little bit more aware of some of the problems that we have to face.

There was an interesting discussion on how we might be able to split up the adversary relationships that so often develop between an administration and faculty, citing the fact that so often the critics, the major critics of the system as it is come from the colleges of arts and sciences in our universities, that maybe breaking up the colleges of arts and sciences somehow might bring about some improved relationship within the institutions. And some couple of institutions have done that. I'm not sure that that is the answer, but that is an interesting issue to contemplate.

Then we did note that as we talked about the reward systems not being adequate, that perhaps we are pointing our fingers at the wrong people when we are critical of the fact that our own staff and faculty are putting their emphasis in the wrong place. Really it's the graduate schools that are doing this. The graduate schools still have not really accepted the fact that there is another breed of institution, the urban university, and that preparation for involvement in the urban university ought to be somewhat different. So the orientation that our people have as they come to us is still in the tradtional concept as they have been brought up through graduate school.

So, we concluded that there are problems, we ought to try to find some way of responding to them, and I think many institutions are in their own way, and institutions are doing this in accordance with the unique circumstances of their particular locale. We concluded, too, that perhaps to survive and to perform the functions that are assigned to us as urban universities, perhaps the next thing that we need to do more of is to begin to differentiate our programs from the traditional type and to put our resources there as we distinguish the ongoing role of an urban university as contrasted to the traditional type. Thank you.

President Raynor: Thanks very much, Don, for an excellent pre-

sentation. Ladies and gentlemen, we've got forty-five minutes or so before us now, and I think through these reports we've gotten some idea and some flavor of the discussions that occurred in the small groups, raising a lot of problems, giving some solutions, covering a multitude of topics. As far as I am concerned right now, I think we should open the matter up for general discussion, not necessarily coming to any agreement or any conclusions — that would be miraculous if we did, I suppose — but at least drawing on the group discussions this morning and our three reporters as resource people. If you have any questions or topics you want to go into further or any suggestions to make, I think this is the time to do it in the time that we have available. Are there any questions you would like to raise for further discussion?

[At this point in the meeting a discussion ensued with respect to collective bargaining experiences on a number of campuses of AUU members. A record of such discussion is maintained in the official files of the Secretary of the Association.]

President Raynor: All right. Thank you. I'd like to move on to one new topic here, maybe using the chairman's prerogative wrongly, but, Tom, in your report you raised this question of who exercises what initiatives in terms of sponsoring new programs that are appropriate for an urban university, and you talked about maybe a new dimension here, the interface with the community in initiating new programs. This is tied in, of course, with the mindset of the faculty, do they want such things, and secondly can they show too much initiative if they want them, or if administrators want them, in bringing them into the community? Would you care to enlarge on that at all, or is that a question of concern to the general meeting here?

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I think so, in part, and I'll respond. But I would hope that those who participated in that breakfast session, who really did the talking and thinking, which I did not, would speak up to this point.

I think there was some apprehension, real apprehension on the part of most of us there that the urban university should not try to be the do-all, the top leader, the total initiator of relationships with urban problems. In other words, we felt that should share with other community organizations, and we should seek to persuade leaders of other community groups to come together and to work cooperatively, but that we should not . . . as one person

put it, we simply do not have the resources. We may have the human talent and may be able to give release time and all this sort of thing, but when it comes right down to it, it takes a lot of money for the resolution of some very, very serious problems. This should be a community-wide effort rather than one solely initiated and paid for by the urban university itself.

It was pointed out that funds are likely to be for terms only. What happens after the money runs out? Certainly the effort must go on, the money has to come from somewhere. In other words, we should not be the procurers only; we should join with others. Have I said it fairly, Father Roesch, do you think?

President Raymond A. Roesch, S.M.: Yes, because we get caught, of course, in these programs that we know and are trying to do and then cannot continue with them. I think Charlie, here, ought to really tell us of his program because the other groups didn't get the advantage of what you were doing in your studies there.

President Raynor: Dr. Johnson, would you care to comment?

Dr. Johnson: We have programs that are partly initiated by others; for example, the police-university consortium that had its origins in the funds made available by the police foundation of $30 million around the country for experimentation in improving the quality of police service. Cincinnati is only one city where some new projects are being started, forming an organization of police officers and university professors to talk about the kinds of programs that we might do jointly that might benefit the police and the university. So here it's not a question of whether we should or should not, it's an area that we are greatly concerned about as participants in a metropolitan area and that we have some expertise for dealing with it.

Of course, we are learning new things, and that's the source of knowledge, working in new problem areas. On the other hand, the university is initiating something that no one has asked us to do in the community with the Rand Corporation to look at urban policy analysis. Rand is working with a number of cities, sponsored by the National Science Foundation. The research applied to national needs has about $12 million for research in this area and spent only about $6 million last year. There is more money supposedly coming for this type of research, so here we are starting a research effort that we want our faculty to benefit from. And we

went the kind of approach that Rand takes, which is perhaps a bit more efficient than the typical kind of research done at a university by university faculty people to feed back into the way we approach certain types or urban analysis.

Of course, we can't do more than we have resources to do. On the other hand, we have people asking for various kinds of services. My basic frame of reference is that if we look a little bit into the history of universities we find that we are kind of making a circle. Look at the Middle Ages where instruction was not done in a classroom, in any particular center, the founding of the University of Paris, how people came together from various parts of the city, and then did classwork, down through the activities in England where one thought that we should go beyond the walls of the university to provide extensive education to people who were not provided with this type of service, And now we're coming to the point where there is a need for education, that you all are aware of, and the question is how do we do it? This then requires the creative dimension that Toynbee refers us to, and we haven't done enough of it yet. So, I'm a new vice president for metropolitan affairs at UC, and I find it very helpful to be here with you gentlemen. I'm learning, and if there are other ideas that you can help me with I'd be happy to hear them before I leave.

President Raynor: Have you felt any special pressures or dynamisms as you branch out in these new urban programs that are really helpful to the community, and maybe on the inside of your institution you are cutting back teaching positions for stable, ongoing programs because of budget crunches? Has there been any special problem in this respect?

Dr. Johnson: Not yet, in that the kinds of things that we are doing are of interest to our faculty. If you want the surest way to insure one's longevity, it's to have the kind of knowledge that's needed, and how does one acquire knowledge outside of being involved in problems where people learn to do things? And so we find that our faculty, we have some young and older faculty, who are gung-ho on our police consortium. We have a mental health effort with the state mental care institutions, and we have a medical school, and of course this whole area of community health is one that is of concern to everybody. So at this point we are not involved in things that are not of interest to our faculty. And I don't think that we should or can force faculty to be involved in areas where they have no interest.

President Raynor: Thank you. Father Reinert.

President Paul C. Reinert, S.J.: Well, it just seems to me that there is another step that follows kind of logically from what Charlie has been talking about, one that urban universities ought to take the unique leadership in, is this whole area of what we are calling non-traditional approaches. I was just interested (we didn't get into it in our group) to find out what some of the urban institutions here . . . I realize that in many cases, I suppose, that it would be considered the role more of the public institutions, but, for instance, in our case we have looked around and talked to the other universities, and at the moment they are not particularly interested in going into non-traditional. So we are trying to develop a program that will begin modestly next fall. And you run into, of course, all kinds of problems, faculty first, in terms of their reaction to a degree program which will definitely not follow many of the traditional tried-and-true, sacrosanct methods. The second is not depleting what you are doing now. As you say, Charlie, you can do just so many things, and trying to set it up so that it will be, hopefully, self-sufficient within a reasonable amount of time. So we are trying to figure out how much seed money we need to get the thing off the ground. But I have been kind of disappointed in trying to find out what people are really planning to do, and I find there is an awful lot of talk about this but not too much specificity.

President Pugsley: I wanted to mention one thing. You put a question in a pretty good framework: the effect that might be created when you are expanding in needed programs of this area versus the faculty and traditional roles. But happily enough for you, Dr. Johnson, that is not a problem in the same way that it is in other institutions, because you went up 1,000 students this year, so the threat is non-existent. Now if you put your situation and had 1,000 enrollment decrease, then I think attitudes might be quite different.

President Reinert: Except that I can see cases, Al, where a decreasing enrollment would indicate that there are other needs that maybe you can serve and increase and improve your enrollment situation that way. For instance, if part of your problem, as certainly is true in our case, that the deteriorating area is cutting down on the possibility of bringing people, let's say, for evening work, and that sort of thing, if you go out into the community you might have a much better chance of getting some of your enrollment.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: You feel that the deteriorating area then, at least, is in some part responsible for . . .

President Reinert: No question about it.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: You're referring, I assume, to a crime of violence . . .

President Reinert: . . . and then an exaggeration of the situation, which immediately takes place when you have just one or two incidents. The way the papers blow it up and people talk it becomes worse than the facts justify.

President Raynor: I did one aspect of — I liked your whole response — but to the point the aspect you emphasized when you said that young faculty members, whether young chronologically or in minds, are open to new programs, and if you give them the opportunity they will participate, even though it means a change from the traditional outlook, if they see the need. And I guess that's our job as presidents and central administrators to make sure that we see what the needs are in the market that we are trying to serve, and as these needs change that we change with them, and in fact lead them in some cases. It's not an easy thing to do, of course.

Dr. Johnson: It seems important also to structure what we do so that it is a learning experience for all faculty as well as the organization or people being served. That's crucial.

President Raynor: That's that interface. There are a lot of things coming together: the faculty, administration, the community needs, the unions, collective bargaining. Yes?

Dr. Brown: That argues, too, for making those functions an inherent part of the university. I think one of the reasons that they don't go well is that they get created only on the basis of what happens to the excess monies at the time. When that happens, when those monies run out the programs go. If the programs became an inherent part of the institution . . . Another thing, too, that the man from Florida indicated this morning, is that these programs I think also . . . one should be very careful to make them of the highest academic quality. Many times we create programs of this sort in order to do what I would think of as a lower quality job. Just because you are trying to develop programs that deal with urban problems, this should not be allowed to get defined as situations where you can now use less competent people than would normally obtain in a traditional department. That, too, frequently happens, and as a consequence that also contributes to deny these kinds of programs.

President Raynor: Yes, Father Roesch.

President Roesch: We had a dilemma last week which we haven't solved yet. The State of Ohio came to us and asked us to participate in a kind of retraining of public administrators, which is very nice. We have a program in that. But they said in order to do that we'd have to furnish matching funds. Then you get yourself into public service, and all of a sudden they say, "Great, we want to do this, but the matching funds, though, they must come out of your institution." Now what do you do?

President Raynor: After you swear, what do you do? *(Laughter)* Any more comments on this topic? Are there other questions that you may have or other topics that you'd like to lay before the house?

President Mackey: I'm sure there's not time for it now, but perhaps in a future meeting I think that at least some of us who are parts of systems ought to look at the implications for development of urban institutions in the context of strengthened positions of state planning boards, state coordinating boards, other bodies, whatever they may be.

It seems to me that, drawing on the experience in Florida, the attitudes of boards of regents, the attitudes of central offices, have to reflect the needs of the urban institutions, because meeting those needs are going to call for reallocations within systems. Relatively few systems have people in the planning positions who understand the differences we are talking about between urban and traditional: the different needs, or even staffing patterns which differ in an urban area where you want the registrar's office to stay open at night not close at five, counseling which has to be different. If you are counseling a lot of part-time students you need more staffing. Some things I guess you do less expensively, but it seems that all of them are more expensive most of the time. And in the programs as well. But the concept of bringing different types of institutions into systems, and making rational decisions on system allocations seems to me to be of critical importance to urban institutions, or we'll be the victims of other people's traditionalism in a way we can't stand.

President Raynor: That's a good comment that you made, and it brings back one that Dr. Guzzetta made in his report about the impact of an accrediting association on a particular institution that is trying to define its urban nature and its service to the urban com-

munity. This is a kind of fantastic thing that you mentioned, Don, on this evening law school. Have there been other problems, have others run into these problems with accrediting associations?

President Mackey: Institutional autonomy and institutional ability to control its own destiny and decision-making is being threatened by a number of bodies and the accrediting agencies or one of those threats. Central planning agencies are another, and the federal government, particularly with the Higher Education Act and some of its provisions this year, is another. And the chain of events that flow from the combined activities of these bodies look to be rather unfortunate . . .

Chancellor Van Arsdale: I was interested in what Don Guzzetta had to say, too. You know, some years ago we used to have a custom of having the commissioners elected by this body as commissioners on the National Commission on Accrediting to make some sort of report. Then we decided, I guess, that that's sort of an extra we could do without. But I'd like to emphasize here and have it appear on the record that this Association does have commissioners on the National Commission on Accredition, and certainly a complaint like Dr. Guzzetta's ought to be taken to the National Commission on Accrediting. I'm one of the commissioners, you are, Bob.

President Spiro: Phil Hoffman, Lloyd Elliott, Joe Klotsche. Elliott is chairman.

Chancellor Van Arsdale: We talk about these things, honestly we do. So if you have complaints . . . I remember one about the business and schools that we took up, and I really want to get into this one, I intend to do something about it. That's why we are serving there, to represent the interests of the member schools.

President Enarson: Could I speak briefly to that? I served last year on the National Commission. And without any disrespect to that organization, it moves with the speed of a glacier. I despair of accomplishing anything except over a span of a decade or two decades, and meanwhile too much is going down the drain.

Without letting up in any way on the pressure that we can exert on the Association of American Law Schools and the ABA, and this is a disgraceful chapter in accreditation in my judgment, I'd like to throw out a suggestion, not for consideration here today but for consideration by the executive committee for next year's

program. I think it might be fun to pick up law as a special case, stop talking about part-time and the broad and the abstract in fashions that nobody can grapple with, organize some sort of a panel discussion in which we have a clearcut, hardnosed, adversary relationship. More precisely, we have the secretary of the Association of American law schools here. We have some law school deans who think differently, such as the young man who is the dean of the law school at Cleveland State University now, where we had one of the largest night school law programs in the nation and fought that battle, and incidentally won it.

I think it would be great fun to include some prominent practitioners who earned their degree in evening programs. I can imagine a panel that was truly constructive, the proceedings of which might be distributed to every single law school in the country, and every university with a law school, and all members of the boards of trustees and to newspapers in the community, and that kind of thing. That's simply a suggestion.

President Raynor: I was listening to the comment that was made earlier, *vis-a-vis* accreditation, and it seemed to me that a topic next year, a good one, would be this whole question of institutional autonomy, and defining and carrying out our roles as urban universities, referring to state boards, regional planning, accrediting associations, unions, faculty groups. They all impact on it, and it might be something into which we could enfold a panel like that. Whatever your pleasure is. Paul.

President Reinert: Let me suggest that is to be theme of the Association of American Colleges in January, so you'll have a lot of background material on this autonomy and pressures from the outside.

President Raynor: I thought I had an original idea! *(Laughter)*

I think our time is running out. I'd like to turn the meeting back to our president and thank, once again, the discussion leaders for their leadership and for the reports this morning, and for the amplifications that they made on their reports in the course of the discussion. Thanks very much. Harold.

President Enarson: Father Raynor and colleagues. I'll take, if I may, about two minutes, not with any pretense of summarizing the discussions, which clearly would be an impossible assignment, but really to speak to several points which I consider extremely important.

I find these sessions extremely helpful if only that I am reminded in clear and unmistakable terms that urban universities are different and have the potential to be more different than they are. I think in a curious sort of way the urban universities really symbolize the kinds of challenges and opportunities which face all of the universities, including the traditional universities, and I have surmounted my earlier annoyance at our continuing inability to come up with a clear, precise, once-and-for-all definition of an urban university. I now see that as a sand trap which engaged my attention for much too long. I think it's important that in a time of extraordinary rapid social change, change which is inadequately reflected in our institutions, that we do stay fluid and flexible, because really what we are trying to do, as I reflect on the discussion, we're really struggling with this question of how you modify institutions to better relate to the real needs of the real people. There's marvelous irony here because we are trying to do today, without federal sanction, without federal resources, without the powerful imagery associated with the land grant movement, what the land grant colleges managed to some degree magnificently and to some degree pitifully.

Also, in addition to the need for doing what's right in education, it's essential that we make it apparent to the American people that we are, in fact, servants interested in their convenience and in their education, because only through that kind of clear public conviction are we going to get the resources it takes to do the job we have.

In conclusion, I really hope that we can do something to tangle head-one with the accrediting agencies, because they do reinforce some of the wost features in American life. It may be that we will not be wholly successful, but owe it to ourselves and our conscience to make an all-out effort to do so.

I've enjoyed this meeting. We'll find ourselves once again in a few moments in the tender mercies of our host, whose been arranging the tables for us down the hall, with or without cocktails, I am not sure. *(Laughter)* I detect a groundswell of opposition to some of the social amenities that are or are not provided.

President Spiro: I think most of us are shocked at the suggestion.

President Enarson: On that cheerful note, we stand adjourned. We'll see you shortly.

LUNCHEON SESSION

Monday, November 6, 1972

The luncheon session of the annual meeting was held in the Pavilion Room of the Jacksonville Hilton Hotel, Jacksonville, Florida. The meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m., Monday, November 6, 1972, by President Harold L. Enarson, President of the Association, who presided.

President Enarson: Ladies and gentlemen: I think I won't recite the glories of the several people who are associated with me at the head table today. But I think, in appreciation of the thoughtful hospitality of Bob and his lovely wife, I think we might join in an expression of appreciation for it. *(Applause.)* And let the record be silent on the absence of sunshine. *(Laughter)*

Mrs. Spiro: We hadn't noticed that; we had such nice people.

President Enarson: You hadn't noticed? Did you get that? And you wonder why she's the president's wife!

And our colleague, Jim Olson, who is going to be vice chairman, and one of these days escalated to this podium of importance. Jim. *(Applause)*

It is my pleasure today to introduce Ralph Widner, who is one of my new colleagues at Columbus. He is the director of what is truly a social invention, the Academy for Contemporary Problems, which is a joint, I guess it's the chosen instrument, of the Bettel Memorial Institute in Ohio State University. And it has one of those marvelous charges that tantalize the mind and the imagination: its task is to help mobilize the best minds and talents from all walks of life in the search for more effective means for resolving pressing social and environmental problems and anticipating future human needs — end of quote. And if I don't miss my guess, one of the first problems he will have is finding parking for these new social engineers. *(Laughter)*

Ralph earned his undergraduate degree from Duke, completed his graduate work at New York University, and is currently an adjunct professor of public administration at Ohio State University. Whether he is on salary or on contract as I am, I am not prepared to say or ask. He has been, was, a congressional fellow of the

American Political Science Association, member of the Committee on Science, Engineering and Regional Development of the National Academy of Sciences, and executive editor of the Journal of Systems Engineering. He was an assistant director of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board in the Office of the Governor, and was Pennsylvania's staff representative on the Conference of Appalachian Governors. This is, I'm sure, what moved him into what was a decade of challenge and achievement, first working with my old boss, Senator Joe Clark, who was then chairman of the Senate Sub-committee on Employment and Manpower, working on the concept of planning for the Appalachian area. Ralph Widner subsequently became executive director of the Appalchian Regional Commission, which, as you may know, comprised the thirteen governors of the Appalachian states and the representatives of the President. Those of you who are presidents know the innocent yet deceitful process by which presidents begin to ferret out where the talent or lack of it rest around a giant campus. All of the reports on Ralph Widner are superb. Ralph. *(Applause)*

Dr. Ralph R. Widner: Thank you, Dr. Enarson. Last night, sitting at these circular tables, some of us had trouble figuring out which was our salad. I realize this morning that's a bit of my problem. I've never met an academic payroll, and there are many problems that you confront that I've never confronted. The question was what would be most useful to tell you about here this afternoon. Last night we remarked about a story Brooks Hayes used to tell; he said you never had to really take an expert seriously anyway. And we asked him why he felt that way, and he said well, some years ago he had gone to a dinner and sat down next to a lady. He leaned over and said, "Mrs. Post?". And she said, "That's right." He said, "Mrs. Emily Post?" She said, "That's right." He said, "Mrs. Post, you're eating my salad."

So, I'm going to eat some of your salad here this morning, and particularly to take off from two points which Dr. Millett raised last night that I think are worth further consideration. One of these you have talked about a good deal this morning, the problem of creative response to the peculiar dilemma in which we find ourselves, and the second a much knottier problem of neutrality.

I think most of us recognize, and Dr. Johnson is certainly one reflection of that, that we're operating in more than an urban area of concern, that indeed a very profound transformation has taken place in the human environment over the last several decades that

is more aptly called metropolization. And it's not peculiar to the United States, it's a worldwide phenomenon.

There is an estimate at the moment that in this decade 350,000,000 additional citizens throughout the world will become residents of metropolitan areas of over 1,000,000 persons. Over one-third of the world's population now lives in metropolitan areas as opposed to what we used to call urban places, which, as most of you know, is defined in the census as anything of over 2500 population.

But the fact is now upon us that there has been a profound transformation in the human environment which has occurred during this century which we can only call metropolization, and that this has a number of serious implications for humanity.

First of all, it fundamentally reorders the relationship that used to exist between the city and the countryside. Secondly, it requires far more elaborate frameworks of organization, more intricate relationships between human beings, a much higher level of interdependence, a much higher level of dependence of each of us upon institutional structures. Indeed, it's become a system so complex that it's vulnerable to the most minor kind of mishap, whether it be a crash on the freeway or a breakdown in the power system.

I think most of us recognize that metropolitanism has opened up vast new arenas for human creativity, but we are all most mindful of the problems it's brought in train: the problems of institutional dependence and the consequent lowering of esteem for many people. The alienation problems we see in the work place are but one reflection of this, the ennui, the increased opportunities for social conflict and crime, and the effects on rural areas of the population depletion and the tax depletion which has occurred as people have moved out of countryside and into the city, and of course probably most visibly the environmental implications of concentrating vast amounts of economic activity and humanity in relatively small areas.

All this is not new to any of us here in the United States. For a decade we have been debating the consequences of this transformation, but despite this awakening of perception about the new problems that now confront us, it's ironic that our perception of the problem lags behind the reality. Our present concerns, if you listen to most of the debate, still center on problems like rural out-

migration to the cities, overcrowding in the cities, how to save the central core, the problems of the inner city, the problems associated with racial discrimination.

We have a debate at the national level about the need for national growth policy which in some way would attempt to achieve what we would "desire in terms of more satisfactory population distribution patterns." We see at the regional level the concerns of, for example, the Southern Growth Policy Board recently created, thanks to the Ford Foundation, in which a group of governors here in the South are going to attempt to head off the South duplicating the urban experiences of the North through ostensibly more rational intelligent public policy. We see the concern in the upper Midwest in the Dakotas and Wisconsin and Minnesota over the depletion in population and tax base that has occurred in the last several decades, literally turning the upper great plains into an unpopulated region of wheat farms.

And we can go around the country and begin to see the first signs of conscious public attempts to curtail growth. Whether we are looking at California, or Florida, or Fairfax County, or any one of a number of other places in the United States, we see the first signs of attempts to control where people can go. And yet we've scarcely begun to think about the ethical implications of attempting to control where people can move and where economic activity can go. It's very difficult when you begin to think about it to distinguish between that kind of policy, in it's infancy now, and the problems created in the suburbs by exclusionary zoning. Are we soon going to tell everybody that they can only move to Bismarck, North Dakota?

The implications of these piecemeal policies are scarcely comprehended at the present time. And, ironically, most of these concerns, no matter how expressed, whether through the urban coalition, or the rural coalition, or state legislative debate, all are almost attempting to close the barn door after the horse has gotten out, because the fact is that the United States has now moved into a totally different set of problems associated with metropolitanization than the debate is really about. With the exception only of the United Kingdom, we are the first country in which the metropolitan transformation has virtually been completed. We have literally run out of rural people to out-migrate. Between now and the year 2000, it's estimated by the Commission on Population Growth in the American Future that only four million of the new residents in metropolitan areas in the United States will come from rural

areas, and that only about ten million will come from foreign immigration. The remaining sixty-one million will come simply from the natural increase of population in families already living in metropolitan areas.

Now if you think about that for a moment, it signals a profound change in the role of the city and the metropolis, because no matter what we think of the slums, and the areas of low income housing, and the more despicable aspects of urban life, which most of us have been free to criticize, there was at least a rationale for their existence. If poor people from overseas or rural areas came into the city with literally no means at their disposal, it was only logical that they would go into that housing that they could obtain at the lowest cost. So by definition the city had to some way provide, whether through conscious public policy or through the unconscious actions of the marketplace, some kind of housing that could accommodate the immigrants. But if suddenly the city is no longer the primary social converter of rural in-migrants or overseas immigrants, and is indeed more a processor of its own population, you have to think a decade or two down the pike about the implications of the structure of the city for this new condition.

The slum no longer can be justified, indeed the structure of the city as we have known it is no longer defensible. The role of downtown in most cities is apt to change most profoundly, no matter what we try to do to go back to the old form. We've seen in the last several decades in the United States profound changes in the retail and other mercantile functions of downtown. As the metropolis has grown it is simply inefficient to try to serve the whole metropolis out of the center. And once a city goes over about a million in size, we begin to see sub-centers develop, sometimes in rather innovative and sometimes in rather haphazard ways that supplant that downtown function. And as the downtown deteriorates, all kinds of problems occur. Now because of the way our cities develop, most of our economic interests are in one way or another identified with downtown, whether through real estate interests or other.

And so we find that most of our city planning, most of our renewal efforts, most of our redevelopment activities, have been designed basically to restore to downtown the functions it once discharged. All the subways have to come together downtown, the mercantile district has to be restored, etc. And in most cases our record has been one of dismal failure, because we simply haven't recognized the new forms of metropolitan life that are now evolving.

We recently did a reconnaissance in Europe to see what the experience had been with all this, and it's interesting to see the extent to which they are duplicating the American pattern. Throughout Europe you find people identify an improvement in their standard of living in terms of two things: number one, the amount of space they have for housing, which creates inevitable pressures towards suburbanization; and, two, the automobile. The country, whether you're talking about a Communist country, or a social democracy, or some more traditionally Western in orientation — everyone of them has made a major commitment to the automobile, because that's the way people read an improvement in their standard of life. We saw throughout Europe the duplication of the American pattern, albeit with variations on ours. The racial question is not the same in Europe, public policy can be more consciously directed in Europe, but by and large we could begin to see the same kinds of forms beginning to evolve over there.

And so we face the situation now of looking toward the future and trying to conceive social policy that's more creative in response to these new conditions than the knee-jerk reactions we have undertaken in the past, in which many of us have been involved. You sense a new air of contrition, whether you talk to the leaders, the business leaders of the urban coalition, or the National Alliance for Business Men, or Secretary Romney, or a governor. Everybody suddenly recognizes that we really didn't know what we were doing in the sixties. We adopted helter-skelter all kinds of public policies. We committed vast sums to them without knowing what we were going to do. We had no sense of strategy. We were adopting the mustard-plaster approaches that might have been appropriate in the thirties but simply did not make sense in terms of the new environment, and on the whole we failed.

The universities were caught up in this. All of us experimented with urban institutes, and urban centers, and technical assistance programs, and new instruction programs, and by and large our batting average was not very impressive, primarily because we didn't understand what we were up against and what conditions we were dealing with.

And so there's this more reflective kind of attitude that you sense throughout the country: let's think through again where we want to go, and let's reassert some kind of control over the process to get there. And the thing you sense, after you begin to talk to many leaders around the country is that both the public and the private sectors are at a loss about how to get a handle on the

situation. They frequently do, as all too many of your constituencies do, turn to the universities and say that if those people had only done their homework, we'd know what to do. And yet we all know the skepticism with which men of action regard the labors that go on in the university vineyard. And I think, quite candidly, as one who has had some experience in the university world from time to time, we ought to recognize that people in the university community have a great deal to learn about society as well, that all of us, whether we're outside looking in or inside looking out, are deficient in our perceptions about what society is really about and how we get from where we are today to where we want to go.

And so it seems to me that there's a special responsibility that was mentioned briefly this morning that now falls to us. The urban universities in particular are going to have to find new ways to underpin intellectually and conceptually the rethinking of the social process that I think leadership in this nation and elsewhere now is beginning to undertake.

Somebody mentioned this morning that the university can't do it solely on its own initiative. I couldn't agree more. It's going to have to be some kind of new cooperative form that enables the outside community to educate, if you will, the university community on the value and ethical questions that concern people out on the street, and at the same time the university has to educate that leadership and that community about what conceptual options are open. So we are the handmaidens of each other, and it's a two-way relationship in which the doors are open to a free exchange of concepts and information and debate. We need to invent new forms for that to occur, to facilitate that process.

When you look at the university scene you see a number of problems that stand in the way of creating that process. First of all, let us be quite candid, for valid, historical reasons we are not properly organized to do that kind of job. We are, by and large, institutions which are vertically organized along disciplinary lines when the problems no longer fit those disciplinary lines. Someone coined a cliche several years ago that we have vertical organizations and horizontal problems. He's right. But that organizational indictment is not peculiar to the university. You can apply it to government, you can apply it to the corporation, the church, any other corporate structure we've developed over the last several centuries in which our drive was fundamentally to create highly skilled specialists. Now we need integrators, and we are not very good at training integrators, synthesizers, inventers, whatever we

want to call them — people who cut across the grain of knowledge.

The second problem we have is the set of incentives we established in the university. Essentially peer judgment is our major quality control. That's a very introverted process when you begin to talk about problem solving in the society at large, because no matter how sound the peer, unless he is a very extraordinary man, he is bound to have limitations. Research undertaken at the initiative of the researcher is not always resopnsive to what the external environment requires.

The third thing you recognize is that no matter who you are, no single institution is going to have a monopoly on the capabilities required to really find the most effective answers to many of these problems. We have a highly fragmented resource. The question is, how do we pull that resource together? How do we pool the talent that may be squirreled away in this university over here and this university over here and this university over here without all cumbersome arrangements that go with consortia and other institutional ties? Are there ways to knit individuals together on a particular issue, and once that issue has been worked disband that group and put a new group together?

I think we have an inadequate model of what social science is about. One of the things that disturbed me last night about Dr. Millett's comments was that there can be such a thing as perfect neutrality. I think it was Norbert Weener that once tried to draw the distinction between the natural sciences and the social sciences, and he said that really you ought to think of a social scientist as a man at a chess board and a natural scientist as a man in his laboratory. Now in the laboratory if you make a mistake in an experiment you know you can go back tomorrow and nature is not going to play any tricks on you, and you can try it again and the laws will stay basically the same; the rules of the game won't change. But when you're in a chess game if you make a slip your opponent will take advantage of it and the rules change every action you take.

The social scientists have tried to copy the natural science model, and in many cases they have copped out on the prescriptive kinds of activities that people more and more are demanding out of the universities. More and more the social sciences are falling into a kind of analytical, sterile scientism that argues that you can approach social questions much the way we approach regular problems in the physical sciences. Yet, as we all know, we're dealing

fundamentally with values. Values are highly relative, and they grow out of creative acts of the whole community. And somehow the social scientist has to be involved in that. Probably we ought to see a reverse trend now, putting more humanism back into social sciences and less scientism. We have the problem of inventing ways for social scientists to do that without falling into the traps of ideology.

But there's one fact that I think most of you have recognized, and that is that the young people on the faculty in many cases, and indeed some of the older people on the faculty, are now sensitive to this charge of irrelevance from society at large, want to find new modes in which they can do their work, but find very few institutional arrangements by means of which they can do it without absorbing their careers. Many students demanding more relevance are similarly searching for new possibilities in the university that would give them an opportunity to work on problems in somewhat different ways than the traditional incentive system and disciplinary organizations might make possible.

So we see now a flowering of new experiments around the country in many universities, some of them with the regular centers and institutes, some of them are whole new conceptions of what the organizing principles of a university ought to be, experiments such as the one at the Green Bay in the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Johnson represents another thrust, George Washington University is another, in which there are attempts to create vehicles in which students and faculty can work on the real problems in a very open process with the community at large.

About a year and a half ago Ohio State and its next-door neighbor, a very large, scientific, non-profit research organization, the Bettel Memorial Institute, decided to try to raise one more flower, a somewhat different kind of approach to the problem. They gave it the rather unctuous title of the Academy for Contemporary Problems. The purpose of the Academy was to draw upon the strengths of the university and of a large scientific organization but to open up the other door so that the community could come in and work directly with specialists and experts on a given social question and have a free interchange between the two — provide a forum for that — and to operate it with a different set of incentives and responsive to a different set of initiatives than the traditional university operation. It was placed out on the edge of the university — of it, but not in it — so that students and faculty who are in-

terested in this kind of research, this kind of work, would have a place to which they could repair and not totally walk away from the academic world; but at the same time it was not placed right in the university structure so that it became a threat to the usual peer-judgment procedures and disciplinary organization.

One decision was made, and that is we're rich in this society in basic research institutions, but we are not rich in institutions which can enable the community as a whole to explore where we're going from here and what the options are that are open to us. We are not rich in institutions that are basically focused on invention, as opposed to analysis, and we're not rich in institutions that try to go the next step from research to action, that is in the translation and communication field. By and large, as most of us know, a great deal of the labor that goes on in academic vinyards is buried in journals, in obscure languages. (I guess the latest estimate worldwide is 200,000 journals.) And yet it's frequent indoor sport in academia to beat the politician over the head and say he's dumb because he doesn't take advantage of what we know. Yet all we're doing is talking to each other, we're not talking to the community. We've never found a good way to move what we know out to where it can be acted upon.

So, the Academy's focus was to concentrate on these questions, and we concluded that if there was one fundamental change in the human condition that needed to serve as an organizing principle of our work it would be the metropolitanization of population, not only in Ohio, not only in the United States, but throughout the world, and that out of this would fall a number of issues that might initially be addressed by the Academy.

First of all were the problems in social arbitration, the refereeing problems that go when so many people live in close quarters. And we would start with the problems of crime and justice, since they're uppermost in most people's minds. We decided to start with the most unpopular part of the problem, the corrections problem. We knew that fundamentally we have in the American corrections ideology a fundamental value conflict. On one hand we say a man, if he's dangerous, should be incarcerated and isolated from society, but that while he's incarcerated and isolated we will rehabilitate him and make him a useful human being. It's the conflict between those two values that has created the debacle we have in our correction system today. It was a fundamental rethinking of corrections that was required. It was obvious that if we just pulled together a group of psychologists and sociologists and began to

think that problem through that nothing would happen. The question was, who's the change agent for dealing with problems of this kind? We finally concluded, after a great deal of thought, that one of the primary change agents would be the people who are trying to run the correction system, particularly those who are most progressive in and thinking most about how the change should occur.

We pulled together the twelve most thoughtful and courageous corrections administrators we could find in the United States at the state level, and they became the nucleus for the team that was then organized to deal with the problem. And everything will be done in their name. In effect you reinforce those few courageous individuals in that field who were trying to improve the system and change it by bringing to them the best academic expertise we could, placing at their disposal the best knowledge we could gather. We now hope that in about a year or a year and a half we will be able to work some change in that system.

A second problem that grows out of metropolitanization we are all familiar with is the change in the work, the nature of work, particularly the increasing emphasis upon work in the services, but also in the repetitive nature of much of the work that we have and the fact that people no longer are content to just tighten a bolt every eight seconds on the assembly line. And so the future of work became the second area of activity with great visibility and concern in Ohio because we're the state of the famous Lordstown Syndron, and it's a highly visible issue that permeates through our whole structure in the state. So we're working with a group of corporations in the state, attempting to find ways to enable the workers themselves to help redesign the work process, enrich job content, and begin to deal with some of the fundamental problems there. There are, of course, educational systems that flow from that. What kind of educational system are we going to need in the future?

Well, enough description of basically how we see this instrument acting. We do see it not as a building in which a group of people will do some work at Ohio State, we see it rather as a mechanism for facilitating the cooperative work of people scattered through many institutions on a given critical social question. And we would hope that in the urban universities of this country, much of that talent can be found and that this might provide a new test vehicle for mobilizing talent, no matter where it's located, to work on a question, and to put it in a form that society itself can act upon.

For the Academy, we're beginning to think more of a community or association of people trying to find a solution to a particular problem, no matter where they live or where they are located, than we are a building with a group of fellows located in it.

Ohio State did a couragous thing. I suppose if Dr. Enarson were president when the decision was made he might have second thoughts about it. But Ohio State committed itself to $5 million over the next ten years to finance half the budget of the institution. Bettel committed itself to the additional $5 million to provide a minimum annual budget of $1 million, and then Bettel threw in (because somebody said they were afflicted with an edifice complex) $2.2 million for a headquarters facility for the Academy. All this is now under way, and the Academy is going into business. And some fundamental questions that you touched on this morning arise.

First of all the problem of neutrality. I would agree with Dr. Millett that in terms of political neutrality absolutely yes, you have to preserve it, no partisanship. Neutrality in terms of the interests in society that can turn to the Academy or work in the Academy, yes, totally impartial. Open to participation by anyone who has a contribution to make, yes, totally neutral, totally open, totally impartial. But in terms of the principles of whatever work goes on there, I don't see the possibility of preserving perfect neutrality, or we're again condemned to the ineffectiveness of scientism.

We're basically dedicated to improving the future environment of a democracy. We have to be committed to democratic principles. Anything that would take us away from such a commitment, it seems to me, would be highly dangerous. We have to be dedicated to the fulfillment of the human individual, rather than the state. We have to be dedicated, probably, to policy explorations that lead to the protection of the planetary environment and not the opposite. So there can't be perfect neutrality on issues.

I think the public outrage that we saw a few years ago toward the university, in terms of its seeming irrelevance to the problems out in the marketplace, the problems out on the street, can be dealt with without corrupting the fundamental mission of the university. Most of our students now want to begin to learn how to function as creators of this new society that's evolving. They don't want to be trained any longer as purely functionaries that are going to fill a fixed niche in a society that's already obsolete. So these kinds of changes rather than detracting from the strengths of the uni-

versity, it seems to me are contributions toward reinforcing its central mission and making sure that the university as an institution will always endure.

It seems to me it's a peculiar challenge that has to be faced by the urban universities, because their emphasis is primarily on service — service to the students and service to the community — more so than any other intellectual institution we have.

And so, I'd like to extend an invitation to the member institutions of this Association that if there's any way that our efforts can be helpful in your own efforts, let's by all means find the opportunities to cooperate, to work together, to share results, and if so I think we can begin to invent the new forms that will guarantee that the university can discharge the functions that our society now so earnestly requires.

Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

President Enarson: On behalf of the audience, and on behalf of the Association, I'd like to thank you, Ralph Widner, for a mind-stretching commentary on the kind of environment in which we live and the kind of environment that we must reshape.

We stand adjourned. It was great to see you all.

Constitution of the Association of Urban Universities
(Adopted November 16, 1915)
APPENDIX A

ARTICLE I — Name

The name of this Association shall be the Association of Urban Universities.

ARTICLE II — Objects

The objects of the Association are: To study the special problems and the special opportunities for service of universities and colleges located in cities and to bring about more effective cooperation between such institutions and the cities in the methods for training for municipal, state, and national service.

ARTICLE III — Dues and Membership

Membership shall be institutional.[1]

Colleges and universities of degree-giving rank[2] may become members upon election by the Association or by the Executive Committee and upon payment of dues.

Each institution shall be entitled to one vote at meetings of the Association.

Membership dues shall be fixed by the Association at the annual meeting.[3]Failure to pay membership dues for two successive years shall result in forfeiture of membership.

ARTICLE IV — Officers

The officers of the Association shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer, who shall perform the duties usually pertaining to their respective offices. The president and vice-

---

[1]The following institutions are listed as charter members in the minutes of the first meeting: University of Akron, Boston University, University of Buffalo, University of Cincinnati, Hunter College John Hopkins University, University of Louisville, College of the City of New York, New York University, Northwestern University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, Reed College, Temple University, University of Toledo, Washington University.

[2]The words "of degree-giving rank" did not appear in the original draft of the constitution but were added by action of the Association in November, 1929, at the annual meeting in Cincinnati.

[3]The annual dues were ten dollars from 1915 to 1928, incl.; fifteen dollars from 1929 to 1946, incl.; thirty dollars from 1947 to 1954; forty dollars fro m1954 to 1958; fifty dollars since 1958; increased to seventy-five dollars in 1966.

president shall be elected annually for a term of one year,[4] and the secretary-treasurer for three years. All officers shall serve until their successors shall be duly chosen.

Nomination for officers shall be made by a nominating committee of three to be appointed at each annual meeting by the president, and opportunity shall be given for other nominations to be made from the floor.

ARTICLE V — Executive Committee

The three officers above named shall constitute the Executive Committee, which shall prepare the programs for all meetings and in the interims between meetings shall act for the Association in every way not contrary to the letter or spirit of this constitution.

ARTICLE VI — Meetings and Quorum

At meetings of the Association, each member institution may be represented by one representative, who shall be entitled to vote, and by any number of delegates, who may participate in discussion but shall not be entitled to vote.

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at such time and place as the Association or the Executive Committee shall determine, provided that each member institution shall be advised of the time and place by mail at least thirty days prior to the meeting.

Twenty-five members duly represented shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business.[1]

ARTICLE VIII — Amendments

The constitution may be amended by unanimous vote at any annual meeting, or, if notice of the proposed change has been given at a previous meeting or published in the official notice of the meeting, it may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting.

The Association voted at the 1936 meeting to adopt the following amendment to the Constitution:

No resolutions or motions bearing on educational or administrative policy, or general resolutions dealing with controversial issues shall be considered except in executive sessions of the Association.

[4]Prior to unanimous agreement in 1961 to amend this section, the vice president was elected every other year for a two-year term.

[1]By action of the membership at the 1954 annual meeting, the quorum was increased from five to twenty-five.

APPENDIX B

Chronological List of Officers of the Association

Presidents

Charles W. Dabney, President, University of Cincinnati, 1914-1915.
Sidney Edward Mezes, President, College of the City of New York, 1915-1916.
Samuel Black McCormick, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, Lemuel A. Murlin, President, Boston University, 1917-1919. 1916-1917.
Frederic A. Hall, Chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis, 1920-1921.
Lotus D. Coffman, President, Universtiy of Minnesota, 1921-1922.
Samuel P. Capen, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, 1922-1923.
Parke R. Kolbe, President, University of Akron, 1923-1924.
William Mather Lewis, President, George Washington University, 1924-1925.
William H. P. Faunce, President, Brown University, 1925-1926. 1926-1927.
Thomas S. Baker, President, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Frederick B. Robinson, President, College of the City of New York, 1927-1928.
Frederick C. Hicks, President, University of Cincinnati, 1928-1929.
Josiah H. Penniman, Provost, University of Pennsylvania, 1929-1930.
Henry J. Doermann, President, University of the City of Toledo, 1930-1931.
Frederick W. Shipley, Dean, Washington University, St. Louis, 1931-1932.
Paul H. Linehan, Director, College of the City of New York, 1932-1933.
Raymond A. Kent, President, University of Louisville, 1933-1934.
Everett W. Lord, Dean, Boston University, 1934-1935.
Charles L. Spain, Executive Vice President, Wayne University, 1935-1936.
Guy E. Snavely, President, Birmingham-Southern College; Executive Secretary, Association of American Colleges, 1936-1937.
Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati, 1937-1938.
Eugene A. Colligan, President, Hunter College, 1938-1939.
Rowland Haynes, President, University of Omaha, 1939-1940.
Winfred G. Leutner, President, Western Reserve University, 1940-1941.
H. E. Simmons, President, University of Akron, 1941-1943.[1]

---

[1]Elected for the year 19411942; consented to serve until 1942-1943 after the 1942 meeting was cancelled.

Henry T. Heald, President, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1943-1944.
Philip C. Nash, President, University of Toledo, 1944-45.
David D. Henry, President, Wayne University, 1945-1946.
R. H. Fitzgerald, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, 1946-1947.
M. O. Ross, President, Butler University, 1947-1948.
Paul F. Douglass, President, The American University, 1948-1949.
James Creese, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1949-1950.
Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President Saint Louis University, 1950-1951.
David A. Lockmiller, President, University of Chattanooga, 1951-1952.
T. R. McConnell, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, 1952-1953.
Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark Collegee of Engineering, 1953-1954.
Edward J. O'Donnell, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1954-1955.
Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1955-1956.
John S. Millis, President, Western Reserve University, 1956-1957. 1961.
Philip Davidson, President, University of Louisville, 1957-1958.
Chester M. Alter, Chancellor, University of Denver, 1958-1959.
Jay F. W. Pearson, President, University of Miami, 1959-1960.
Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1960-1961.
Clarence B. Hilberry, President, Wayne State University, 1961-1962.
Carter Davidson, President, Union College, 1962-1963.
Milo Bail, President, University of Omaha, 1963-1964.
T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr., President, Bradley University, 1964-1965.
Philip G. Hoffman, President, University of Houston, 1965-1966.
Richard E. Humphreys, President, The Cooper Union, 1966-1967.
J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1967-1968.
Leo McLaughlin, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1968-1969.
Norman A. Parker, Chancellor, Chicago Circle Campus, University of Illinois, 1969-1970.
Lloyd H. Elliott, President, The George Washington University, 1970-1971.
Harold L. Enarson, President, Cleveland State University, 1971-1972.
John P. Raynor, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1972-1973.

Vice-Presidents

Everett W. Lord, Dean, Boston University, 1914-1915.

Augustus R. Hatton, Professor of Political Science, Western Reserve University, 1915-1917.

Parke R. Kolbe, President, University of Akron, 1917-1919.

Frank P. Graves, President, University of the State of New York and Commissioner of Education, State of New York, 1919-1921.

Winfred G. Leutner, Dean, Western Reserve University, 1921-1923.

Frederick W. Shipley, Director, Division of University Extension, Washington University, 1923-1925.

Richard R. Price, Director of University Extension Service, University of Minnesota, 1925-1927.

Theodore J. Grayson, Director, Evening School of Accounts and Finance, University of Pennsylvania, 1927-1929.

Vincent W. Lanfear, Director, Downtown Division, University of Pittsburgh, 1929-1931.

Rufus D. Smith, Director, University Extension Division, New York University, 1931-1933.

Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati, 1933-1935.

Charles J. Deane, Vice-President and Dean, Fordham University, 1935-1937.

Parke R. Kolbe, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1937-1939.

H. E. Simmons, President, University of Akron, 1939-1941.

Henry T. Heald, President, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1941-1943.

David D. Henry, Executive Vice-President, Wayne University, 1943-1945.

Ben Cherrington, Chancellor, University of Denver, 1945-1947.[1]

M. O. Ross, President, Butler University, 1946-1947.[2]

James Creese, President, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1947-1949.

David A. Lockmiller, President, University of Chattanooga, 1949-1951.

Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark College of Engineering, 1951-1953.

Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1953-1955.

Philip Davidson, President, University of Louisville, 1955-1957.

Jay F. W. Pearson, President, University of Miami, 1957-1959.

Clarence B. Hilberry, President, Wayne State Univeristy, 1959-1961.

Carter Davidson, President, Union College, 1961-1962.

Milo Bail, President, University of Omaha, 1962-1963.

---

[1]Resigned, 1946.

[2]Elected to complete Dr. Cherrington's term which would have ended at the close of the 1947 meeting.

Thomas H. Carroll, President, George Washington University, 1963-1964.

William F. Kelley, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1964-October 1965.

Philip G. Hoffman, President, University of Houston, October-November, 1965.

Richard F. Humphreys, President, The Cooper Union, 1965-1966.

J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1966-1967.

Leo McLaughlin, S.J., President, Fordham University, 1967-1968.

Norman A. Parker, Universtiy of Illinois at Cnicago Circle Campus, 1968-1969.

Lloyd H. Elliott, President, George Washington University, 1969-1970.

Kirk E. Naylor, President, University of Nebrask at Omaha, 1970-1971.

John P. Raynor, S.J., President, Marquette University, 1971-1972.

James C. Olson, Chancellor, University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1972-1973.

Secretary-Treasurers

Walter E. Clark, Professor of Political Science, College of the City of New York, 1914-1915.

Frederick B. Robinson, Director, Evening Sessions, College of the City of New York and Dean, School of Business and Civic Administration, 1915-1926.

C. S. Marsh, Dean, Evening Session of the School of Business Administration, University of Buffalo, 1926-1935.

Roscoe M. Ihrig, Director, Division of General Studies, Director of Evening Courses, Dean of Freshmen in Engineering, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1935-1940.

F. W. Schockley, Director, University Extension, Summer Sessions and Late Afternoon, Evning, and Saturday Classes, University of Pittsburgh, 1940-1947.[1]

David D. Henry, Executive Vice Chancellor, New York University, 1947-1956.[2]

Robert W. Van Houten, President, Newark College of Engineering, 1954-1956.[3]

Norman P. Auburn, President, University of Akron, 1956-1965.

T. W. Van Arsdale, President, Bradley University, 1965-1968.

Robert Harry Spiro, President, Jacksonville University, 1968-

[1]Completed Dr. Roscoe M. Ihrig's term which ended in October, 1941 and was elected for a three-year term, 1941-1944, and for a second three-year term, 1944-1947.

[2]Resigned, 1954.

[3]Appointed to fill Dr. David D. Henry's unexpired term.

APPENDIX C

Registered Attendance, Association of Urban Universities
58th Annual Meeting, Jacksonville, Florida November 5-6, 1972

AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF
Dr. & Mrs. D. J. Guzzetta
President

ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES
George A. Flowers, Editor
Director of Public Relations,
Jacksonville University
Marion Jarrell, Asst. Sec.-Treas.
Assistant to the President
Jacksonville University

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY
Chancellor & Mrs. T. W. Van Arsdale, Jr.

CINCINNATI UNIVERSITY
Dr. Charles Johnson
Vice President

DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF
Raymond A. Roesch
President

DELAWARE, UNIVERSITY OF
Dr. C. Harold Brown
Director, Division of Urban Affairs

DETROIT, UNIVERSITY OF
Malcolm Carron, S.J.
President

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
Rev. Joseph A. Lauritis, C.S.Sp.
Vice President for University
Relations and Secretary

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Dr. Lloyd C. Elliott
President

HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF
President & Mrs. Philip G. Hoffman

ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF, CHICAGO CIRCLE
Chancellor Warren B. Cheston
Vice Chancellor Eugene Eidenberg

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
Dr. & Mrs. John C. Buhner
Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties

JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY
Dr. & Mrs. Robert H. Spiro
President

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
John Raynor
President

MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF
Carl E. B. McKenry
Vice President for Academic Affairs

MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF, DEARBORN
Leonard E. Goodall
Chancellor

MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF AT KANSAS CITY
James C. Olson
Chancellor

NEWARK COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
President & Mrs. William Hazell

NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF AT CHARLOTTE
Dr. & Mrs. D. W. Colvard
Chancellor

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
Martha S. Luck
Dean of the Evening Divisions

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Dr. Harold Enarson
President

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY
Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.
President

SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
President & Mrs. Leslie S. Wright

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
Dr. & Mrs. Cecil Mackey
President

WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF
MILWAUKEE
J. Martin Klotsche
Chancellor
WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
Robert J. Kegerreif
Vice President & Director
of Admissions
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY
A. L. Pugsley
President

APPENDIX D

Financial Report
November 1, 1971 to October 31, 1972

Book Balance November 1, 1971		$ 5,864.21
RECEIPTS:		
Annual Meeting	$ 984.85	
Annual Dues	6,450.00	
Total Receipts		$ 7,434.85
Total Credits		$13,299.06

DISBURSEMENTS:

Annual Meeting

ck. no.			
71-22	Wescott Printing—programs	$ 124.28	
71-26	Sheraton Blackstone Hotel—food and rooms	1185.28	
72-1	Gladys Barbour—transcription of proceedings	184.00	
72-9	Douglas Printing—proceedings	1310.53	
			$2804.09

Newsletter

ck. no.			
72-2	Triad Printing—newsletter	479.50	
72-12	Triad Printing—newsletter	506.02	
			$ 985.52

Stipends

ck. no.			
71-28	George Flowers—fourth quarter	250.00	
71-29	Marion Jarrell—fourth quarter	250.00	
72-3	George Flowers—first quarter	375.00	
72-4	Marion Jarrell—first quarter	375.00	
72-6	George Flowers—second quarter	375.00	
72-7	Marion Jarrell—second quarter	375.00	
72-10	George Flowers—third quarter	375.00	
72-11	Marion Jarrell—third quarter	375.00	
			$2750.00

Travel and Dues

ck. no.			
71-18	Delta Air Lines—M. Jarrell, Chicago	136.00	
71-19	George Flowers—airline ticket, Chicago	136.00	
71-20	Marion Jarrell—expenses, Chicago	25.75	
71-21	George Flowers—expenses, Chicago	13.15	
71-23	David G. Brown—annual meeting	113.35	
71-24	Lloyd Elliott—annual meeting	185.52	
71-25	Robert Spiro—expenses, Chicago	19.00	
72-8	Jacksonville University—reimburse for ACE dues	375.00	
72-8	Jacksonville University—reimburse for Robert Spiro	125.00	
			$1128.77

Miscellaneous

ck. no.			
71-27	Natl. Conference on Higher Education	35.00	
72-5	Postmaster	9.78	
72-8	Jacksonville University—reimburse for postage	.87	
72-13	Beaver Enterprises—mailing newsletter	90.00	
			$ 135.65

Total Disbursements, November 1, 1971 to October 31, 1972	$ 7804.03
Book Balance, October 31, 1972	$ 5495.03

APPENDIX E

Procedure For Application For Membership In Association of Urban Universities

Eligible for membership in the Association of Urban Universities are accredited four-year institutions of higher education located in urban areas and particularly concerned with the problems and opportunities incident to urban location, including adult education and other community service. Membership is in the name of the institution, not of a unit or a division of the institution.

One hundred twenty-three institutions are now members of the Association, which was organized in 1914. The annual meeting is usually held on the first Sunday and Monday in November in the "home" city of one of the member institutions. Proceedings of the annual meeting are published. A Newsletter containing items of interest to urban universities is issued periodically during the year. Annual institutional dues are $75.00.

Applications for membership may be made by letter addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Robert Spiro, President, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida. The letter should be accompanied by a statement concerning the accrediting of the institution, its objectives and its interest in community service. Also, there should be a brief statement concerning institutional history and organization, enrollment, and nature of educational service. One or two publications of the institution will be of interest to the Membership Committee.

Attendance at annual meetings is not limited to representatives of member institutions but is open to interested representatives from any urban institution. An institution applying for membership is expected to be represented at the annual meeting at which its application is considered.

It is expected that presidents of member institutions will personally participate in the work of the Association and, whenever possible, attend the annual meeting.

APPENDIX F

Institutional Libraries Holding Complete Sets of Proceedings of the Association's Annual Meetings

University of Akron
Boston University (The Chenery Library)
Butler University
University of Cincinnati
University of Chicago
City College of New York
University of Denver
Drexel Institute of Technology
Harvard University (Harvard College Library)
University of Illinois
University of Louisville
New York University (Washington Square Library)
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
University of Southern California
State University of New York at Buffalo
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Toledo
Wayne State University
Western Reserve University